



114-7

4

Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Part of the  
ADDISON ALEXANDER LIBRARY,  
which was presented by  
MESSRS. R. L. AND A. STUART.

Case,

Division *P.O. 14*

Shelf,

Section *2712*

Book,

No. *1851*











NOTES,  
CRITICAL AND PRACTICAL,  
ON THE BOOK OF  
EXODUS;

DESIGNED AS A GENERAL HELP TO  
BIBLICAL READING AND INSTRUCTION

---

BY GEORGE BUSH,  
PROF. OF HEB. AND ORIENT. LIT. N. Y. CITY UNIVERSITY.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.  
VOL. II.

---

NEW-YORK:  
PUBLISHED BY NEWMAN AND IVISON,  
199 Broadway.  
CINCINNATI: MOORE & ANDERSON. AUBURN: J. C. IVISON & CO  
CHICAGO: S. C. GRIGGS & CO DETROIT: A. McFARREN.

---

1852

ENTERED

According to act of Congress, in the year 1841, by

GEORGE BUSH,

In the Clerk's office of the District Court of the Southern District of  
NEW YORK.

---

STEREOTYPED BY  
FRANCIS F. RIPLEY,  
No. 128 Fulton Street, N. Y.

---

# THE HEBREW THEOCRACY.

(INTRODUCTORY TO CHAPTERS XXI.—XXIII.)

THE portion of the Book of Exodus comprised in chapters 21, 22, and 23, contains the record of what God spake to Moses, when he 'drew near to the thick darkness,' after the people had retired from their close vicinity to the sacred mount. The contents of these chapters relate for the most part to the *judicial* or *political* regulations which God was pleased to enact for his people, with the occasional intermixture of precepts pertaining to the system of worship. But in order to convey an adequate idea of this department of the Pentateuch, it will be proper to present to the reader a compendious view of the peculiar civil and ecclesiastical polity of the Hebrews, reserving to our subsequent notes, as occasion may require, a more detailed exhibition of its several distinguishing features.

The form of government which prevailed among the descendants of Abraham, prior to the time of Moses, was the *patriarchal*. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, governed their respective families in virtue of that paternal authority which was, in the early ages of the world, universally conceded to the fathers and heads of households. The families thus governed were the natural germs of *tribes*, every one of which obeyed its own *prince* (נָשִׂיא *nasi*), who was originally the first-born of the *founder* of the tribe, but in progress of time appears to have been elected. In proportion as the numbers of the tribes were augmented their *heads* or *patriarchs* became powerful chieftains, and under the title of *princes*, *elders*, and *heads of tribes*, answered very nearly to the *sheikhs* and *emirs* of the Bedouin Arabs and other nomade races of modern times spread over the regions of the East.

Such was the form of the primitive social organization of the chosen people. But after the deliverance from Egypt, when they were to be set apart, and destined to the great object of preserving and transmitting the true religion, God saw fit to bestow upon them a new civil and religious polity wisely adapted to the purposes which, as a nation, they were intended to subserve. Of these, one of the principal undoubtedly was, to keep alive the grand fundamental truth, that *there is but one living and true God, and that he only is to be worshipped and adored, loved and obeyed*. With a view to this a peculiar constitution was adopted, familiarly known as the *Theocracy*; according to which God became *the temporal king and supreme civil magistrate of the nation*. Not that it was possible for Jehovah to sink his character of Lord and Master of the universe in his capacity as civil ruler of the Hebrews. He was still, as Creator and Judge, the God of each individual Israelite, as he is the God of each individual Christian; but he moreover sustained, both to every *individual* Israelite, and to the whole *collective body* of the Israelitish nation, the additional relation of *temporal sovereign*. In this character he solemnly proffered himself to the people at Mount

Sinai, and in this character he was, with equal solemnity, accepted by their united voice, Ex. 19. 4—8. This polity was doubtless adopted with the design that the obedience which they rendered him as *King* might become in some measure identified with the reverence due to him as *God*; as while they yielded the former, they would be less likely to withhold the latter. And it is to be noticed, that it was not till after the transaction recorded Ex. 19. 7—9, in which God was recognised in his character of *immediate Ruler* of that people, that he proceeded to promulgate from the clouds of Mount Sinai the system of laws and ordinances designed for them as a religious community. In this system, however, the *moral code* of the Decalogue, which was both uttered and recorded in a different manner from the rest, is to be considered as given, not in his character of national king of the Israelites, but in that of the Creator and Lawgiver of the universe. A like distinction is occasionally to be made elsewhere; but it is clear that in the chapters before us nearly every ordinance and statute can be referred to some one of the ten commandments, and is to be considered as merely a developement of its sense and spirit. Yet as they are termed emphatically ‘judgments,’ they undoubtedly belonged more especially to the *civil* government, and formed a kind of *common law*, very analogous to the common law of other lands, having respect to matters at issue between man and man, which became the subject of *judicial* decision. Though of a *temporal* character in themselves, they still involved *moral* considerations, and were for the most part based upon some express precept of the Decalogue.

Since then the Jewish polity was strictly a Theocracy, in which Jehovah appeared as the immediate sovereign and the people of Israel as his immediate subjects, this relation would naturally give rise to certain important results, in the administration of that economy, which well deserve our notice. In the first place, no authority was vested, by the Mosaic constitution, in any one man or body men, nor even in the whole nation assembled, to make new laws or alter old ones; their sovereign Jehovah reserving this power exclusively to himself. On the same grounds, the Hebrew constitution recognized no one hereditary chief magistrate, nor gave any power, even to the whole nation, to elect a supreme governor. It was the especial prerogative of Jehovah to appoint whomsoever he pleased to preside over the people under the title of *judge*, as his own immediate vicegerent. And such men, we know, were from time to time raised up as the exigencies of the state required them, and, under a special commission from heaven, wrought the most signal deliverances for their countrymen.

Another important consequence of the Theocratic polity was, that idolatry became not only the transgression of a moral precept of most aggravated character, but also *an act of treason against the state*. It was a virtual rejection of the authority of their acknowledged Ruler. It was a breach of the original compact, an open rebellion against God, a positive casting off of sworn allegiance, and therefore, on the established principles of all governments, justly meriting capital punishment. We are not to be surprised, therefore, to find idolatry, with witchcraft, magic, necromancy, and other kindred practices connected with it, treated as a crime equal to that of murder, and subjecting all those who were guilty of committing or abetting it, to the utmost penalty of the law. The punishment of an idolatrous city was the irrevocable ban or anathema called

הֶרֶם *herem*, followed by complete destruction, Lev. 19. 31 ; 20. 6. Deut. 17, 2—6. Nay, so strict was the prohibition on this subject, that the inciter to idolatry was never to be pardoned, even though he should claim the character of a prophet, and utter predictions which should be exactly fulfilled, Deut. 13. 2—12. The nearest relations and the dearest friends were to be delivered up to just punishment if they enticed to idolatry ; and the accuser, as the first witness, was required to cast the first stone at the convicted traitor. Even a foreigner who dwelt among the Hebrews, could not be exempted from capital punishment if he practised idolatry himself, or tempted others to practise it ; for by so doing he became a rebel, and a leader of rebellion, against the king, and against the whole civil government.

Again, if it be admitted that God sustained the character of *temporal* prince and legislator to the Israelites, nothing is more natural than that what may be termed the *civil* or *political* laws enacted by him in that character should be enforced by *temporal* sanctions. Accordingly, as it is beyond a doubt that the rewards and punishments annexed to the Jewish civil code were mainly *temporal*, we find in this view of the subject a sufficient explanation of the fact. The absence in the books of Moses of any very explicit notice of the future existence of the soul, or of a future state of rewards and punishments, has indeed afforded ground of cavil to the skeptic, but there is certainly something inconsistent in the position, that God acted as the *temporal* sovereign of Israel, and yet that while thus acting he administered the laws of the land, not by the sanction of *temporal* rewards and punishments in this world, but by the sanction of future rewards and punishments in *another* world. Accordingly, any one has only to turn to the declarations of the law itself in Deut. 11. 26—28 ; 28. 1—45, to be convinced that such is not the character of its sanctions.

It is not, however, to be inferred from this, as Warburton has done, that the fact of a future existence, and of future rewards and punishments, was *unknown* either to Moses or to the nation of Israel. Although the doctrine of future retribution is taught rather by incidental reference than by authoritative declaration, yet the evidence that it was known and believed under the Mosaic economy is abundant and conclusive, as has been shown by Graves (Lect. on the Pentateuch), Faber (on the Three Dispensations), and others. Certain it is, that we cannot suppose the nation of Israel to have enjoyed *less* of the revelation of a future state than the patriarchs from whom they were descended, and of these the Apostle expressly assures us, that ‘they died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth, seeking and desiring a better country, even an heavenly.’ But the main purpose for which the Jewish economy was established did not require, that any other than temporal sanctions should be explicitly propounded under it. The laws of the Theocracy were to be enforced by an extraordinary providence, and in accordance with this, the grand motives placed before the Hebrews to pursue the good and to avoid the evil were those which were derived from the benefits and calamities, the rewards and punishments of this life. The distinct and prominent exhibition of the doctrine of future awards was reserved for the developements of that more spiritual system,

which we enjoy in the gospel of Him who 'has brought life and immortality to light.'

Once more, it is to be remarked, that in conformity with the peculiar genius of that polity, and in order that the Hebrews might have their relation to God kept constantly before their eyes, the Most High, as their King, caused a royal tent to be erected in the centre of the encampment, where the pavilions of all kings and chiefs were usually erected, and to be fitted up with all the splendor of royalty, as a moveable palace. It was divided into three apartments, in the innermost of which was the royal throne, supported by golden cherubs; and the foot stool of the throne, a gilded ark containing the tables of the law, the Magna Charta of church and state. In the ante-room a gilded table was spread with bread and wine, as the royal table, and precious incense was burned. The exterior room or court, might be considered the royal culinary apartment, and there music was performed, like the music at the festive tables of eastern monarchs. (Lev. 21. 6, 8, 17. Num. 28. 2. Deut. 23. 4. Ezek. 44. 7.) God made choice of the Levites for his courtiers, state-officers, and palace guards; and Aaron for the chief officer of the court and first minister of state. For the maintenance of these officers, he assigned one of the tithes which the Hebrews were to pay as rent for the use of the land. He finally required all the Hebrew males, of a suitable age, to repair to his palace every year, on the three great annual festivals, with presents, to render homage to their king; and as these days of renewing their homage were to be celebrated with festivity and joy, the second tithe was expended in providing the entertainments necessary for those occasions. In short, every religious duty was made a matter of political obligation; and all the civil regulations, even the most minute, were so founded upon the relation of the people to God, and so interwoven with their religious duties, that the Hebrew could not separate his God and his king, and in every law was reminded equally of both. Consequently the nation, so long as it had a national existence, could not entirely lose the knowledge, or discontinue the worship of the true God. The succeeding notes will show that this view of the drift and design of this remarkable structure is by no means inconsistent with its having been framed throughout with a *typical* import, and designed to shadow forth the leading spiritual mysteries of the gospel. But that it actually sustained the character here ascribed to it, we think there can be no doubt.



# THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

## CHAPTER XXI.

**N**OW these *are* the judgments which thou shalt <sup>a</sup> set before them.

<sup>a</sup> ch. 24. 3, 4. Deut. 4. 14. & 6. 1.

### CHAPTER XXI.

This and the two following chapters contain the record of what God spake to Moses when he 'drew near to the thick darkness,' after the people had retired from their close vicinity to the sacred mount. Their contents relate, for the most part, to the *judicial* or *political* regulations which God, as the Theocratical sovereign of the chosen people, was pleased now to enact and impose upon them. These 'judgments,' however, though in themselves mainly of a temporal character, having respect to matters between man and man, which might become the subject of *judicial* decision, still involved *moral* considerations, and were in fact based upon some one or other of the express precepts of the Decalogue. They are, therefore, very properly introduced in this connexion, immediately after the moral code, to which they have continual reference. In our estimate of the polity of which these laws form a part, we must have regard to the circumstances of the people, and the period for which they were designed, and though we may admit that it would be very possible for God to have given a code intrinsically more excellent and holy, yet we shall be ready to conclude that no better one could have been given in the then circumstances of the Jewish race.

1. *These are the judgments, &c.* Heb. מִשְׁפָּטִים *mishpotim*; from שָׁפַט *shaphat*, to judge, and here signifying the

2 <sup>b</sup> If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and

<sup>b</sup> Lev. 25. 39, 40, 41. Deut. 15. 12. Jer. 34. 14.

*statutes, judicial laws, or rules of judgment*, by which their civil government was to be conducted, and according to which the magistrates were to give judgment in disputed cases or differences arising between man and man. Gr. δίκαιωματα, *just judgments*. As their government was a Theocracy, their entire legislation was from God. No part of their code, whether civil or ecclesiastical, originated with themselves, or was left to be modified by the dictates of human prudence.

### *Laws respecting Servants.*

2. *If thou buy an Hebrew servant, &c.* Heb. כִּי תִקְנֶה *ki tikneh*, when thou shalt purchase, procure, acquire; a term of which the general import is that of *acquisition* or *possession* in whatever manner obtained. See Notes on Gen. 4. 1.—14. 19. The following instances of the use of the term will go to show that its sense is modified by the subjects to which it is applied, and that it does not by any means necessarily convey the idea of Hebrew servants' being bought and sold as goods and chattels, as they are under the system of modern slavery, especially in our own country. Eve said, Gen. 4. 1, 'I have gotten (קָנִיתִי *kanithi*) a man from the Lord.' And she accordingly named him *Cain* (קַיִן *kayin*), that is, *gotten, acquired*. Prov. 15. 32, 'He that heareth reproof *getteth* (קֹנֶה *koneh*) understanding.' Is. 11. 11, 'The Lord

in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.

shall set his hand again *to recover* (לְקַנּוֹת *liknoth*) the remnant of his people.' Ps. 78. 54, 'He brought them to this mountain which his right hand *had purchased* (קָנֶתָהּ *kanethah*).' Neh. 5. 8, 'We of our ability have *redeemed* (קָנִינוּ *kaninu*) our brethren the Jews, that were sold unto the heathen.' Prov. 8. 22, 'The Lord *possessed me* (קָנָנִי *kanani*) in the beginning of his way.' Here, as the service among the Hebrews was for the most part voluntary, the 'buying an Hebrew servant' may as legitimately imply *the buying him from himself*, that is, *buying his services*, as any other mode of purchase. Indeed, as there is no positive proof that Hebrew servants were ever made such or kept in that condition by force, against their own consent, except as a punishment for crime, the decided presumption is, that such is the kind of 'buying' here spoken of. As to the term עֶבֶד *obed, servant*, it comes from עָבַד *abad, to serve*, which is applied variously to the *serving* of worshippers, of tributaries, of domestics, of Levites, of sons to a father, of subjects to a ruler, of hirelings, of soldiers, of public officers, &c. With similar latitude, the derivative noun is applied to all persons doing service for others, irrespective of the ground or principle on which that service was rendered. Accordingly it embraces in its range of application, tributaries, worshippers, domestics, subjects of government, magistrates, public officers, younger sons, prophets, kings, and the Messiah himself. To interpret it 'slave,' or to argue, from the fact of the word's being used to designate domestic servants, that they were made servants *by force*, worked without pay, and held as articles of property, would be a gross and gratuitous assumption. The meaning of the present passage undoubtedly is, 'If thou dost in any way become

3 If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were

possessed of a brother Hebrew, so as to have a right to command his services (in consequence of which right alone he becomes a 'servant'), retain him not in a state of servitude more than six years.'—¶ *In the seventh year.* In what sense 'the seventh year' is to be understood here is not obvious; whether as the *sabbatical year*, in which the land lay fallow, or as *the seventh year from the time when the servant was bought*. Maimonides was of the latter opinion, and this appears on the whole the most probable; for Moses uniformly calls it 'the seventh year,' without using the term 'sabbatical year,' or apparently at all alluding to it. And besides, when he describes the sabbatical year in Lev. 25. 1—7, he says nothing about the manumission of servants. Yet it is to be presumed that if the *jubilee* year should occur before the six years' service had expired, his manumission would take place of course in virtue of the general law, Lev. 25. 40, unless he had been sold for a crime.—¶ *He shall go out free for nothing.* That is, without being required to pay his master any thing as a consideration for the shortened term of service. Being made free by law he was to pay nothing for his liberty. Nor was he required to pay for any thing else. Although he might during the period of his service have labored under sickness, and put his master to cost, yet no compensation was to be expected from him at the time of his release; for a man's servant was during his servitude as his own possession for which he was bound to provide at his own charges.—One cannot but be struck with admiration at perceiving what kind provisions were made for the Hebrew bondman; how carefully he was guarded from violence, injustice, and wrong. The circumstances under which a native He-

married, then his wife shall go out with him.

4 If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons

brew might become a slave were the following ; (1.) When under the pressure of extreme poverty he sold his liberty to preserve himself or his family from suffering ; Lev. 25. 39, 'If thy brother be waxen poor and be sold unto thee,' &c. (2.) When sold for a like reason by a father ; v. 7, 'If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant,' &c. Comp. Neh. 5. 5. (3.) Insolvent debtors might, as a punishment, be sold for servants, or, by way of payment, put into the hands of their creditors as slaves ; 2 Kings, 4. 1, 'My husband is dead—and the creditor is come to take unto him my two sons to be bondmen.' (4.) A thief who was unable to make restitution for what he had stolen, according to the proportion required of him by the law, was sold by way of requital to him whom he had robbed ; Ex. 22. 3, 4, 'If he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft.' (5.) Slaves were acquired by the issue of the marriages of slaves. The condition of slavery, however, is undoubtedly regarded in the Scriptures as an evil, yet, as it was an evil that had prevailed in the world long before the establishment of the Jewish polity, infinite wisdom did not see fit at once to root it out, but enacted such meliorating laws in respect to it as would tend to divest it of its most aggravated and cruel features, and render it as tolerable as a state of bondage could well be. In like manner he *regulated* without *extirpating* polygamy.

3, 4. *If he came in by himself.* Heb. בנפשו *begappo*, with his body. That is, with his body only ; in his single person ; having neither wife nor children. Gr. αὐτος μόνος, *himself alone*. It is evidently used in contradistinction to the being married in the next clause.

or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself.

If a free-born Hebrew, who had sold himself for a bondman, had previously had a wife, this relation was not disturbed by his servitude, at the expiration of which her freedom was to be restored along with her husband's. But a different case is supposed in the next verse. There the marriage is one that takes place during the continuance of the servitude, and seems to be of the same nature with the 'contubernium,' *cohabitation*, of the Romans, which, instead of 'conjugium,' *wedlock*, was the term applied to the marriages of slaves. A master gave his servant a wife during the period of his service, but retained her and her children after he regained his liberty, the connexion being of course dissolved by a divorce. But it is generally maintained by commentators, that the wife thus given was to be a heathen or Gentile bond-maid, and not a Hebrewess, which they gathered from Lev. 25. 44, 'Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about thee ; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.' This passage, however, does not of itself make it certain that such was the case, although the idea is undoubtedly countenanced by v. 7—11, of the chapter before us, which would seem to intimate that if a Jewish woman were given in marriage at all, it must be to her master or his son. Moreover, as it appears from Deut. 15. 12, that Hebrew bondmen and bondmaids came under the same law of manumission at the end of six years, we cannot perceive on what lawful grounds such a wife, if of the Hebrew stock, should be detained in servitude after the close of the allotted time. The Jewish critics adopt the same view. The children produced from

5 <sup>c</sup> And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free :

6 Then his master shall bring him

<sup>c</sup> Deut. 15. 16, 17.

such a *contubernium* were regarded as being also slaves, and constituted the class called 'born in the house,' Gen. 14. 14.—17. 23; 'sons of the house,' Gen. 15. 3; or 'sons of the handmaid,' Ex. 23. 12. Of those Abraham had 318; and as it might naturally be supposed that servants thus forming a part of the household, and imbibing attachments to their master from their earliest years, would be more deserving of confidence than strangers, he puts arms into their hands, when his service required it; a measure, by the way, entirely inconsistent with the genius of American slaveholding, which will not admit of masters' putting swords or fire-arms into the hands of their slaves.

5, 6. *And if the servant shall plainly say, &c.* Heb. אָמַר יְאֹמַר *amar yomar, saying shall say*. That is, shall say it again and again, so that his purpose shall become a matter of notoriety. This is intimated in order that there might be evidence of such an intention being in the highest degree voluntary and unconstrained.—¶ *Then his master shall bring him unto the judges.* Heb. אֵל הָאֱלֹהִים *el ha-Elohim, to the gods*. That is, to the magistrates, who are called 'gods,' Ps. 82, 1, 6. John, 10. 34, 35. Chal. 'Before the judges.' Gr. πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, *to the judgment, or tribunal, of God*. The phraseology is remarkable, but the prevalent sentiments of the Orientals in regard to sovereignty of all sorts tend to illustrate it. The Egyptians, according to Diodorus Siculus (B. I. c. 90), looked upon their kings in the light of divinities; and from the travels of Arvieux we learn that among the modern Arabs the usual form of citation,

unto the <sup>d</sup> judges: he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall <sup>e</sup> bore his ear through with an awl and he shall serve him for ever.

<sup>d</sup> ch. 12. 12. & 22. 8, 28. <sup>e</sup> Ps. 40. 6.

when one is summoned to the place of justice is in these words, 'Thou art invited to the *tribunal of God*.' It would seem that they regarded a judge or magistrate in the administration of justice as such a lively image of the Deity that they were led to apply to him in that capacity a divine title.—It is easily conceivable that a servant, who had a good master, might wish to remain with him permanently during life, particularly if he had lived in *contubernio* with one of his master's female slaves and had children by her, for whom he would naturally cherish a strong affection, and from whom he must separate if he accepted his freedom. In such a case he was permitted to bind himself forever to the service of the master; but in order to guard against all abuse of this permission, and especially that it might appear that he was not fraudulently or forcibly detained against his will, it was ordained that the transaction should be gone about judicially, and with appropriate formalities. For this purpose, after being brought before the magistrate, and declaration probably made of his intention, he was taken back and his ear bored through with an awl at the door of his master's house, in token of his being, as it were, *affixed* to it henceforward the rest of his days. This boring of ears was in the eastern countries, a badge of servitude. Thus Juv. Sat. I 102, 'Why should I fear or doubt to defend the place, though born upon the banks of the Euphrates as the *tender perforations in my ear* evince?' upon which the ancient scholiast remarks, 'that this was a sign of slavery.' It is supposed that the Psalmist, Ps. 40. 6, speaking in the person of the Mes-

siah alludes to this custom; 'Mine ear hast thou opened.' Heb. 'dug, pierced through;' expressive of his entire devotion to his father's service. Michaelis remarks, 'That this statute of Moses made boring the ears in some degree ignominious to a free man; because it became the sign whereby a perpetual slave was to be known, and that for this reason he would have been very glad to have procured the abandonment of the practice of servants' thus permanently adopting a state of vassalage.'—¶ *He shall serve him for ever.* That is, as long as he or his master lived. Some make it to be till the period of the next ensuing jubilee, but the other sense is probably more correct. Thus, 1 Sam. 1. 22, 'That he may appear before the Lord, and thus abide *for ever*;' i. e. as long as he lives. This will appear still more evident by supposing a case that might easily have happened. A slave was sold three years before the beginning of the jubilee. What was to be done with him at the expiration of that time? If he were then released by the law of the jubilee, how was it possible for him to serve the six years here prescribed in the law? This brings us to so palpable an inconsistency in the law, that we are on the whole forced to the conviction that the regulation before us had no respect whatever to the jubilee. Let the grand object of that institution be considered. It was, that every man might 'return to his possession'—which could not be alienated for a longer time—and to his family; Lev. 25. 10—24. But it does not appear that the privilege extended alike to *every class* of servants. A difference would naturally be made between the case of one made a slave by his crimes, and one who became such by his misfortunes. Consequently the law contained, Lev. 25. 39—42, seems to have no reference to cases like that before us; 'And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor,

and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant: But as an hired servant, and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee: and then he shall depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.' The drift of the enactment here cited is entirely different from that of the one under consideration. The latter speaks of one who was in the fullest sense of the Jewish law a 'bond-servant' or slave; the former of one who was not to be made a 'bond-servant,' but only a 'hired-servant.' The latter relates to one who was sold for his *crimes*; the former to one who disposed of his services on account of his *poverty*, which was no crime. The term of servitude appointed by the law before us was invariably *six years*; the period fixed by the other was *till the next jubilee*, which might be any number of years from one to fifty. The design of the law in Exodus, in ordaining that the thief should be made a slave for six years, was that he might thereby be punished for his crime, and that the money given for him should make some compensation to the person he had injured; while the object of the law in Leviticus was that the poor man should be received as a menial into an Israelitish family, not to punish him, but that he might find the means of comfortable support in his necessities. The design of the statute giving the slave his option, at the end of six years, either to leave his master or to remain with him 'forever,' could not possibly be that he should 'return to his own family and to the possession of his fathers,' for as long as he lived in bondage he could not do this, and his crime was supposed to have cut him off from

7 ¶ And if a man <sup>f</sup>sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, he shall

<sup>f</sup> Neh. 5. 5.

the right to his paternal estate. But the design of the other law in giving the impoverished hired-servant his liberty at the next jubilee, was expressly that he might return to his family and again enjoy his patrimonial inheritance. As then these two ordinances appear to be entirely distinct from and unrelated to each other, there is no necessity for interpreting the phrase 'for ever,' as signifying the same as 'till the next jubilee.'

7. *If a man sell his daughter, &c.* We must still bear in mind what has been said above respecting the import of *selling persons* under the Mosaic law. It was simply equivalent to *selling one's services*. It conveyed no ownership. It did not recognise the odious doctrine of modern slavery that a man may become a chattel, and be held and treated simply as an article of property. So in the case before us, a father might be reduced to such an extreme of poverty as to be constrained to have recourse to the measure here mentioned, of disposing of the services of a daughter, when of a young and tender age, for a consideration. But it is clear from the context that when this was done, it was, usually at least, upon some engagement or expectation that the person who bought her would take her, when of age, as his wife or concubine. Her purchase as a servant was her betrothal as a wife. This is confirmed by the comment of Maimonides, who says; 'A Hebrew handmaid might not be sold but to one who laid himself under obligations to espouse her to himself or to his son, when she was fit to be betrothed.' Jarchi also on the same passage says, 'He is bound to espouse her to be his wife, for the money of her purchase is the money of her *espousal*.' An example of this selling of daughters by impover-

not go out <sup>g</sup> as the men-servants do.

<sup>g</sup> ver. 2, 3.

ished parents is related in the subsequent history of the Jews, Neh. 5. 1—8 —¶ *She shall not go out as the men-servants do.* That is, shall not go out upon the same conditions, but upon better. She shall be better provided for at her departure; inasmuch as a feeble woman is less able to protect herself and secure her own welfare, than a strong and able-bodied man. There is an apparent contradiction between this passage, and Deut. 15. 17, where, in speaking of the male servant's having his ear bored in token of perpetual servitude, it is said, 'And also unto thy maid-servant shalt thou do likewise.' Michaelis explains this by supposing that the Hebrew legislator, after the lapse of forty years, made an alteration in his laws, and added the ordinance contained in Deuteronomy. 'He did not patronize slavery; at least he endeavored to mitigate its evils to native Hebrews, and to confine it within certain limits of duration. On their departure from Egypt, he did so with respect to males, and availing himself of an ancient and merciful usage, which terminated servitude after seven years, he introduced it by a written statute, as an incontrovertible right. After the people had been accustomed to this piece of clemency, he went a step farther in the law which he gave forty years after, and established the very same ordinance in behalf of females.' But we think it more probable that there was originally a difference in the case of a woman sold for theft, or who had sold herself because of her poverty, and of a daughter sold by her father, in expectation of her being espoused by her master or one of his sons. In this last case, which is the one here considered, she would be entitled to peculiar tenderness, and provision is made accordingly. But in the

8 If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed :

former, which seems to be contemplated in Deuteronomy, she was to come under the same regulations with the manservant who declined going out free at the end of his prescribed term. As it is perfectly conceivable that a woman might be influenced by the same motives as a man to remain with her master, and as there is no proof that such was not the case, we think this the most natural mode of reconciling the apparent discrepancy between the two passages. However this may be, it is certain that in the time of the prophet Jeremiah it was conceived that the statutes which gave freedom to the Hebrew slaves in the seventh year, extended not only to the male, but also to the female sex, Jer. 34. 9—16, a passage which may be very profitably read in this connexion.

8. *If she please not her master.* Heb. אִם רָעָה בְּעֵינֵי אֲדוֹנֶיהָ *im raah be-ainē adonīha*, if she be evil in the eyes of her master; a very common Hebraic idiom, importing, however, not moral evil, but rather the want of personal attractions. 'Good,' in like manner, is in repeated instances used in a sense equivalent to 'goodly,' or as an attribute of the outer man. See Note on Gen. 39. 6.—

¶ *Who hath betrothed her to himself.* As if the purchase under these circumstances was considered as a virtual betrothal, so that no other formalities were requisite. But it is to be noted that the original presents here a various reading, in which our translation has followed the margin (לֹר *lo*, to him) instead of the text (לֹא *lo*, not). In the one case the correct rendering is, 'who doth not (לֹא) betroth her;' in the other, 'who hath betrothed her to himself (לֹר).' Either mode of reading yields substantially the same sense, only in the latter case 'betrothing' signifies the preliminary engagement or affi-

to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her.

ancing, which the master is supposed to have entered into; in the former, the actual consummation of the marriage; that is, he hath not acted according to the mutual understanding of the parties; he hath not fulfilled expectation. In doing one thing he hath not done another which was virtually implied in it. It is obvious that according as one or the other of these senses is assumed, the particle employed will be לֹא *lo*, not, or לֹר *lo*, to him. The Scriptures present several other instances of the same textual diversity of reading, on which commentators have labored with great assiduity. Of these an ample account is given in Vitringa's *Obs. Sac. L. III. c. 14. § 14*—¶ *Then shall he let her be redeemed.* Heb. הִפְדָּהּ *hephdah*, shall cause her to be redeemed. Implying not merely consent to the act of another, but positive efforts on his own part to effect the step; he shall see to her being redeemed; i. e. by her father, or any of her kindred who has a mind so to do. But if this were not done, he was not allowed to marry her to another person, or to a 'strange nation,' a phrase which has usually been understood to mean, a stranger of the Israelitish nation, one of a different tribe or family, because it is supposed no Hebrew slave could be sold to a Gentile. But we see not why the literal rendering may not be adhered to. The Hebrew master must not sell her to one of another nation, who might desire to have her as a concubine, and with whom she might be in danger of forgetting the true religion. It was an ordinance by which the highest welfare of the individual was kindly consulted.—

¶ *Seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her.* Heb. בִּבְגָדוֹ *be-bigdo bah*, in his deceitfully treating her, i. e. as a continuation of it. Having wronged

9 And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters.

10 If he take him another *wife*; her food, her raiment,<sup>h</sup> and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish.

11 And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. 7. 5.

her by frustrating her hope of marriage in his own family, he was not to add one injury to another by disposing of her in a foreign connexion, where her principles and her happiness might be alike endangered.

9, 10. *He shall deal with her after the manner of daughters.* That is, he shall deal with her as a free woman; shall give her a dowry, and bestow her in marriage as if she had been his own daughter. But whether he or his son had married her and then afterwards taken another wife, still this was not to operate to her disadvantage. She was to be suitably maintained, and her due matrimonial privileges continued to her, or else she was freely to be set at liberty.—¶ *Her duty of marriage.*

Heb. עֲנוּחָה *anothah*. Gr. τὴν ὁμιλίαν αὐτῆς, *her accompanying, converse, cohabitation*, which Paul, 1 Cor. 7. 3, expresses by the phrase of ‘due benevolence,’ equivalent to conjugal converse.

—¶ *Shall he not diminish.* Heb. לֹא יִגְרַע *to yigra, shall not keep back*, as the term is rendered Num. 9. 7, ‘And those men said unto him, We are defiled by the dead body of a man: wherefore are we kept back (נִיגָרָה *niggara*), that we may not offer an offering of the Lord in his appointed season among the children of Israel?’ The Gr. in this place has οὐκ ἀποστερησει, *shall not defraud*, whence the apostle in speaking of the same subject, 1 Cor. 7. 5, says, ‘Defraud ye not one another (μη ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους) except it be with consent, &c.’ Gr. ‘And he shall not de-

12 ¶ <sup>i</sup> He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death.

13 And <sup>k</sup> if a man lie not in wait, but God <sup>l</sup> deliver *him* into his hand; then <sup>m</sup> I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee.

<sup>i</sup> Gen. 9. 6. Lev. 24. 17. Numb. 35. 30, 31. Matt. 26. 52. <sup>k</sup> Numb. 35. 22. Deut. 19. 4, 5. <sup>l</sup> 1 Sam. 24. 4, 10, 18. <sup>m</sup> Numb. 35. 11. Deut. 19. 3. Josh. 20. 2.

fraud her of necessities, raiment, and converse.’ Chal. ‘And her nourishment, raiment, and communion he shall not prohibit.’ Sam. ‘And her habitation he shall not take away.’ Arab. ‘And her times he may not diminish.’ Syr. ‘And conjugal enjoyment he shall not lessen.’

11. *If he do not these three.* That is, either of the three things mentioned above, v. 10.—¶ *Then shall she go out free without money.* Upon coming to marriageable age, if the master neither married her himself nor disposed of her otherwise, he was not only to set her free without remuneration, but also, as appears from Deut. 15. 12—17, to furnish her liberally with gifts.

#### *Laws respecting Murder and Manslaughter.*

12. *He that smiteth a man.* That is, mortally, as is evident from what follows, and so amounting to *wilful murder*. See Note on Gen. 9. 6.—¶ *Shall be surely put to death.* Heb. מוֹת יָמוּת *moth yumath, dying shall be made to die*. The sentence is here expressed in the most emphatic language, implying that no ransom was to be taken for the life of the wilful murderer. Num. 35. 31, ‘Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death; but he shall be surely put to death.’

13. *If a man lie not in wait.* Heb. לֹא צָדָה *asher la tzadah, whoso hath not laid in wait*. That is, whoso hath not done such a deed premeditatedly; who hath not waylaid another



14 But if a man come <sup>n</sup> presumptuously upon his neighbour, to slay

<sup>n</sup> Numb. 15. 30. & 35. 20. Deut. 19. 11, 12. Hebr. 10. 26.

in order to take his life. The original term צַדָּה *tzadah* is closely related to צַדָּה *tzud*, to hunt, and implies that *insidious watching* which hunters practice in securing their game.—¶ *But God deliver him into his hand.* Heb. אִנָּה לַיָּדוֹ *innah le-yado*, doth offer by chance to his hand. Gr. παρέδωκεν, *hath delivered*. The words evidently have respect to a case where the slayer is not prompted by malice, nor endeavors by covert means to put to death a fellow being, but the catastrophe is owing solely to the special providence of God, which had put one man in the way of a deadly blow from another without any agency or design of his. This constitutes what is called in modern codes *accidental homicide* or *chance-medley*, and for which, under the Mosaic system, there was an express provision in the cities of refuge, hereafter to be described. In Deut. 19. 4—6, we have by way of illustration a specified case in which the manslayer was to be entitled to the benefit of this provision; ‘And this is the case of the slayer, which shall flee thither, that he may live: Whoso killeth his neighbor ignorantly, whom he hated not in time past; as when a man goeth into the wood with his neighbor to hew wood, and his hand fetcheth a stroke with the axe to cut down the tree, and the head slippeth from the helve, and lighteth upon his neighbor, that he die; he shall flee unto one of these cities, and live; lest the avenger of the blood pursue the slayer, while his heart is hot, and overtake him, because the way is long, and slay him; whereas he was not worthy of death, inasmuch as he hated him not in time past.’—¶ *I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee.* This place, during the sojourn of Israel in

him with guile; ° thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die.

° 1 Kings 2. 28,—34. 2 Kings 11. 15.

the wilderness, was the tabernacle, as appears by the mention of the altar in v. 14; but after their arrival in the land of Canaan there were six cities of refuge appointed, as we learn, from Num. 35. 6, et. seq. From the case of Joab, 1 Kings, 2. 28, it would appear that the temple was occasionally resorted to for this purpose even after the cities of refuge were established.

14. *If a man come presumptuously, &c.* Heb. יָצִיד *yazid*, deal proudly, presumingly, high-handedly. Chal. ‘Shall do or act impiously.’ The Heb. verb צָדָה *zud*, which properly signifies to deal proudly or presumptuously, is applied also to the person who sins, not ignorantly or inadvertently, but wilfully, knowingly, of set purpose, inasmuch as such an offender is considered as disobeying the known law of God through the *pride, self-sufficiency, and presumptuous elation* of his spirit. Accordingly Moses, Deut. 17. 12 and 18. 22, speaks of *presumptuous sins* under the denomination of זָדוֹן *zadon*, which comes from the same root, indicating a kind of transgression entirely different from sins or errors of ignorance, inadvertence, or infirmity. Joab’s murder of Abner comes clearly within the scope of this statute, and accordingly we find that his fleeing to the sacred asylum of the altar availed him nothing. 2 Sam. 2. 19—23.—3. 26, 27. 1 Kings, 2. 28—32.—¶ *Thou shalt take him from mine altar.* That is, if he has fled unto the altar for protection. But the Jerus. Targ. gives another turn to the expression; ‘Though he be the High Priest who standeth and ministereth before me, from thence shall ye take him and kill him.’ We may perhaps safely admit that both senses are included. It would certainly be important to teach

15 ¶ And he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death.

16 ¶ And p he that stealeth a man,

p Deut. 24. 7.

that no official sanctity would be allowed to screen the wilful murderer from justice.

*Law respecting the Smiting of Parents.*

15. *He that smiteth his father or mother, &c.* He was to be put to death even though the blow should not be fatal, but merely leave a wound or bruise; otherwise the crime mentioned in this verse is included in that specified in v. 12. The crime of parricide is not expressly mentioned in the code of Moses, any more than it was in that of Solon, and probably for the same reason; the law did not presuppose a sin of such horrid enormity.

*Law respecting Man-stealing.*

16. *He that stealeth a man, &c.* Gr. ὅς εαν κλεψῇ τις τινα των υιων Ισραηλ, *whosoever stealeth any one of the sons of Israel.* Chal. 'He that stealeth a soul of the sons of Israel.' And thus it is explained by Moses himself, Deut. 24. 7, 'If a man be found *stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel*, and maketh merchandize of him,' &c. This was no doubt the primary drift of the law. It had respect to a crime committed by an Israelite upon the person of an Israelite. For this crime the punishment of death was expressly denounced; and *that* with the utmost degree of rigor. The alleviations which operated in the case of other thefts was precluded here. In other cases, if the article stolen had not been alienated, or if there was reason to look for repentance and restitution, some mitigation of the punishment ensued. But the man-stealer was absolutely doomed to die, whether he had already sold the person stolen, or whether he still had him in

and q selleth him, or if he be r found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.

q Gen. 37. 28. r ch. 22. 4.

his own hands, neither alienated nor used for service. -Comp. Deut. 24. 7. But the spirit of the interdict undoubtedly applies to all cases of man-stealing or kidnapping. In the sight of heaven it is a crime charged with the blackest guilt. This is clear from the penalty annexed to it, especially as contrasted with the penalty for stealing property, Ex. 22. 14. If a man had stolen an ox and killed or sold it, he was to restore five oxen; if he had neither sold nor killed it, two oxen. But in the case of stealing a *man*, the first act drew down the utmost power of punishment; however often repeated or aggravated the crime, human penalty could do no more. The fact that the penalty for *man-stealing* was death, and the penalty of *property-stealing*, the mere restoration of double, shows that the two cases were judged on totally different principles. This will appear still more evident from the remarks on this passage by Mr. Weld in his tract entitled 'The Bible against Slavery.' 'If God permitted man to hold man as property, why did he punish for stealing that kind of property infinitely more than for stealing any other kind of property? Why punish with death for stealing a very little of *that* sort of property, and make a mere fine the penalty for stealing a thousand times as much, of any other sort of property—especially if by his own act, God had annihilated the difference between man and *property*, by putting him on a level with it? The guilt of a crime, depends much upon the nature, character, and condition of the victim. To steal is a crime, whoever the thief, or whatever the plunder. To steal bread from a full man, is theft; to steal it from a starving man, is both theft and

17 ¶ And <sup>s</sup> he that curseth his fa-

<sup>s</sup> Lev. 20. 9. Prov. 20. 20. Matt. 15. 4. Mark 7. 10.

murder. If I steal my neighbor's property, the crime consists not in altering the *nature* of the article, but in taking as *mine* what is *his*. But when I take my neighbor himself, and first make him *property*, and then my *property*, the latter act, which was the sole crime in the former case, dwindles to nothing. The sin in stealing a man, is not the transfer from its owner to another of that which is already property, but the turning of *personality* into *property*. True, the attributes of man remain, but the rights and immunities which grow out of them are annihilated. It is the first law both of reason and revelation, to regard things and beings as they are; and the sum of religion, to feel and act toward them according to their value. Knowingly to treat them otherwise is sin; and the degree of violence done to their nature, relations, and value, measures its guilt. When things are sun-dered which God has indissolubly joined, or confounded in one, which he has separated by infinite extremes; when sacred and eternal distinctions, are derided and set at nought, then, if ever, sin reddens to its 'scarlet dye.' The sin specified in the passage, is that of doing violence to the *nature* of a *man*—to his intrinsic value as a rational being. In the verse preceding the one under consideration, and in that which follows, the same principle is laid down. Verse 15, 'He that smiteth his father or his mother shall surely be put to death.' Verse 17, 'He that curseth his father or his mother, shall surely be put to death.' If a Jew smote his neighbor, the law merely smote him in return; but if the blow was given to a *parent*, it struck the smiter dead. The parental relation is the *centre* of human society. God guards it with peculiar care. To violate that, is to violate all.

ther or his mother, shall surely be put to death.

18 ¶ And if men strive together,

Whoever tramples on that, shows that *no* relation has any sacredness in his eyes—that he is unfit to move among human relations who violates one so sacred and tender. Therefore, the Mo-saic law uplifted his bleeding corpse, and brandished the ghastly terror around the parental relation to guard it from impious inroads. Why such a difference in penalties, for the same act? Answer. 1. The relation violated was obvious—the distinction between parents and others self-evident, dictated by a law of nature. 2. The act was violence to nature—a suicide on constitutional susceptibilities. 3. The parental relation then, as now, was the focal point of the social system, and required powerful safe-guards. 'Honor thy father and thy mother,' stands at the head of those commands which prescribe the duties of man to man; and throughout the Bible, the parental state is God's favorite illustration of his own relations to the human family. In this case, death was to be inflicted not for smiting a *man*, but a *parent*—a *distinction* made sacred by God, and fortified by a bulwark of defence. In the next verse, 'He that stealeth a man,' &c., the SAME PRINCIPLE is wrought out in still stronger relief. The crime to be punished with death was not the taking of property from its owner, but violence to an *immortal nature*, the blotting out of a sacred *distinction*—making *men* 'chat-tels.'—¶ And selleth him. Jarchi, in his comment on this stealing and making merchandize of men, gives the meaning thus: 'Using a man against his will, as a servant lawfully purchased; yea, though he should use his services ever so little, only to the value of a farthing, or use but his arm to lean on to support him, *if he be forced so to act as a servant*, the person compelling him but

and one smite another with a stone, or with *his* fist, and he die not, but keepeth *his* bed :

19 If he rise again, and walk abroad <sup>t</sup> upon his staff, then shall he that smote *him* be quit : only he

<sup>t</sup> 2 Sam. 3. 29.

once to do so, shall die as a thief whether he has sold him or not.†

#### *Law respecting the Cursing of Parents.*

17. *He that curseth his father or his mother, &c.* Heb. מַקְלִיל *mekallîl*, from the root קָלַל *kalal*, signifying primarily to *make light of, to disparage*, and thence in Piel to *utter violent reproaches, to imprecate evil, to curse*. The denunciation undoubtedly applies to him who uses light, contemptuous, or opprobrious language of his parents. Thus also Prov. 20. 20, 'Whoso curseth (מַקְלִיל *mekallîl*) his father or his mother, his lamp shall be put out in obscure darkness.' Such a conduct subjected the offender to capital punishment, because it implied the utmost degree of depravity. He who could break the bonds of filial reverence and duty to such a degree as in word or action to abuse his own parents, clearly evinced thereby that he was lost to all goodness and abandoned to all wickedness.

#### *Law respecting injurious Strife.*

18, 19. *If men strive together, &c.* Heb. יִרִיבֵן *yeribun*, from the root רִיב *rib*, applied properly to *verbal strife, contention, wrangling*; just that kind of *angry debate* which is apt to lead to blows. Accordingly the Gr. renders it, εὐαν λοιδωρονται δυο ανδρες, *if two men reproach*. The law evidently has respect to a case where two men begin with a quarrel of words, and proceed to blows, either with the fists or such weapons as come readily to hand. Provided the injury was not fatal, no further punishment was inflicted on the injurer than that of being obliged to

shall pay *for* the loss of his time, and shall cause *him* to be thoroughly healed.

20 ¶ And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand ; he shall be surely punished.

pay the expenses of the other's cure, and his 'sitting,' or 'cessation' (שִׁבְתוֹ *shibto*), i. e. the loss of time arising from his confinement. Gr. 'He shall pay for his ceasing from labor, and the charges of healing.' Chal. 'He shall restore his loss in being idle from work, and pay the hire of the surgeon.' By the phrase, 'he shall be quit,' is meant that he shall be considered *guiltless* of a capital of fence.

#### *Law respecting Injuries to Servants.*

20, 21. *If a man smite his servant &c.—he shall be surely punished.* Heb. נָקַם יִנְקֶם *nakom yinnakēm*, *avenging he shall be avenged*. This verb, we believe, both in this and other cases, has at one and the same time a twofold import, viz. that of punishment to the offender, and of vindication or avenging to the offended. It is here, doubtless, to be understood, both of the servant who should be killed, and of his master who killed him ; the one was *avenged* in the very act by which the other was *punished*. The precise kind of punishment to be inflicted is here left undetermined. But as his smiting with a rod instead of any more deadly instrument, showed that it was his intent to correct and not to kill him, it can scarcely mean that he should suffer the punishment of death. This derives support from the next verse, which enacts, that if the servant survive a day or two, the master shall not be punished, 'for he is his money,' i. e. purchased with his money, and therefore the presumption would be, that he could not have intended to kill him, and he was considered to be sufficiently punished by

21 Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for <sup>u</sup> he is his money.

22 ¶ If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the wo-

<sup>u</sup> Lev. 25. 45, 46.

the loss which he had incurred. This remark, however, it will be observed, applies to the latter case, where the smitten servant continued a survivor a day or two; but in the other case, when he died under his master's hand, it was to be presumed that undue severity had been used, for which he was to be punished at the discretion of the magistrate in view of all the circumstances. The law, moreover, is thought to be applicable rather to foreign servants than to Israelites, for over Hebrew servants masters were expressly forbidden to lord it harshly, Lev. 25. 39, 40.

*Law respecting Injury done to Pregnant Women.*

22, 23. *If men strive and hurt a Woman, &c.* Here the original word for *strive* (יָנַצְזוּ *yinnatzu*) is entirely different from that above remarked upon, v. 18, and implies literally *fighting*, as it is the same word with that employed to denote the 'striving together' of the two Hebrews whom Moses endeavored to separate, Ex. 2. 13. The injury of a pregnant woman in consequence of a fray between two individuals is here treated, as it deserves to be, very seriously; first, because she was no party in the origin of the fray; and, secondly, because the divine law would show that it protects, with preeminent care and tenderness, a woman in that helpless situation and her unborn offspring. If the consequence were only the premature birth of the child, the aggressor was obliged to give her husband a recompense in money, according to his

man's husband will lay upon him, and he shall \* pay as the judges determine.

23 And if *any* mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life.

24 <sup>y</sup> Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot,

\* ver. 30. Deut. 22. 18 19. <sup>y</sup> Lev. 24. 20. Deut. 19. 21. Matt. 5. 38.

demand; but in order that his demand might not be unreasonable, it was subject to the final decision of the judges. On the other hand, if either the woman or her child was any way hurt or maimed, the law of retaliation at once took effect.—¶ *Then thou shalt give, &c.* That is, either thou, the offender; or thou, the judge, shalt give in passing sentence.

*Lex talionis, or Law of like for like.*

24. *Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, &c.* This enactment undoubtedly recognises the prevalence, in the early stages of society, of the idea that every man has a right to do himself justice and revenge his own injuries. In the infancy of all communities, when the redress of wrongs and the punishment of crimes is not yet fully settled in the hands of magistrates, this idea operates with all its force, and the principle acted upon is, that the punishment of offenders shall be an exact equivalent for the injuries sustained. This law, if it may be so termed, was undoubtedly in vogue among the Hebrews, as well as other nomade people, from the earliest periods, and the Most High accordingly, having to deal with a people but little accustomed to the restraints of settled government, and seeing it necessary to interpose the greatest obstacles in the way of the exercise of private passions, was pleased so far to consult their circumstances and notions, as to make every injury done to the *person* of another punishable by strict retaliation on the aggressor. Simple and natural as

this principle of justice seems to be, it is still a species of satisfaction verging close upon the *barbarous*, and easily perverted to wanton caprice and savage cruelty. For this reason, although the principle of the *lex talionis* was retained in the Mosaic code, yet its harsher features were softened by the exercise of it being placed, not in the hands of private individuals, but of the public magistrate. Nor does it appear that even in this form it was ever a *compulsory* mode of retribution. Although sanctioned as a general rule by which the decisions of magistrates were to be governed, yet it is probable that a pecuniary satisfaction might be made by the offender in cases of this nature provided the injured party would consent to it. When it is said, Numb. 35. 31, 'Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer,' the inference is that for minor offences satisfaction might be taken. This is confirmed by the testimony of Josephus, who says, that the law allowed him who was injured to estimate his own damage, and to accept of a pecuniary compensation, unless he had a mind to be reckoned severe or cruel. Selden, a modern authority of great weight, says, 'This doth not mean, that if I put out another man's eye, therefore I must lose my own, (for what is he better for that?) though this be commonly received; but it means, I shall give him what satisfaction an eye shall be judged to be worth.' This is perhaps the most correct view of the *lex talionis* in its actual operation, as we find no instance on record where the law was *literally* carried into effect. The spirit of it might be, that the injuring party should in justice receive a punishment similar to the injury he had inflicted, but was allowed to redeem his eye, tooth, hand, &c., by a suitable payment to the injured person. A law of the same character was in existence among the Greeks and Romans, and was understood to ad-

mit the like commutations. In several countries of the East, moreover, we find the law of retaliation obtaining at the present day in regard to the same class of injuries as those which came under its operation in the Hebrew statute book. In some of the Indian principalities, for instance, we learn that it has been the immemorial practice, that if one person accidentally wounded another with an arrow, though ever so slightly, the sufferer, or any of his family, has a right to demand that he shall be wounded in the same manner; and a traveller in Persia mentions having met with a person who had lost one of his limbs in consequence, as he was informed, of having in a scuffle shattered the leg of his antagonist so severely that amputation was necessary. 'The practice among the Bedouins may serve in some degree to illustrate this subject, as well as the nice balancing which the law of retaliation operates in producing. In case of murder, the friends of the murdered may, at their option, either retaliate or accept a heavy blood fine. But no other offence is, in practice, liable to capital or corporal punishment. Pecuniary fines are awarded for every offence, and as they are generally heavy, in comparison with the delinquency, the dread of incurring them tends much to keep the wild natives of the desert in order; the nature and amount of the fines which immemorial usage has assigned to particular offences being well known to the Arabs. Burckhardt says, 'All insulting expressions, all acts of violence, a blow however slight, (and a blow may differ in degree of insult according to the part struck,) and the infliction of a wound, from which even a single drop of blood flows, all have their respective fines ascertained.' The kadi's sentence is sometimes to this effect:—

'Bokhyt called Djolan 'a dog.' Djolan returned the insult by a blow upon Bokhyt's arm; then Bokhyt cut Djo-

25 Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

26 ¶ And if a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish; he shall let

him go free for his eye's sake.

27 And if he smite out his manservant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth; he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake.

lan's with a knife. Bokhyt therefore owes to Djolan—

For the insulting expression . 1 sheep

For wounding him in the

shoulder . . . . . 3 camels

Djolan owes to Bokhyt—

For the blow on his arm . 1 camel

Remain due to Djolan 2 camels and 1 sheep.'

Other affairs are arranged on the same principle. It is observable, that in case of theft in the home camp, or that of a friendly tribe, (for robbery and theft are not in other cases considered crimes), the criminal is condemned by an ancient law to the loss of his right hand, but custom allows him to redeem his hand on payment of five she-camels to the person he purposed to rob.' *Pict. Bib.* See on this subject the remarks of Michaelis in my 'Scripture Illustrations,' p. 83.—The purpose for which our Lord alluded to this law in his sermon on the Mount, Mat. 5. 38—40, and the construction which he put upon it, may here properly receive a passing remark. The original law, as we have intimated, did not positively bind the injured party to exact its literal execution, but left him free to forgive or to accept the commutation of a pecuniary mulct; but still if the prescribed penalty were required by him, the judge was perhaps bound to inflict it. The party injured could not be the executioner of this law, but was obliged for that purpose to repair to the magistrate; for to the judges only were the words addressed, Deut. 19. 21, 'Thine eye shall not pity; but life shall go for life, tooth for tooth, &c.,' nor is there any evidence that private persons in our Savior's time were in the habit of taking the redress of their wrongs into

their own hands, and making this rule a plea for the perpetration of acts of private revenge. Our Savior is evidently designing to forbid something to the Christian which was allowed to the Jews; and this we conceive was to dissuade, or rather to inhibit them from *rigorously insisting on their right*. He forbids his disciples 'to resist evil,' by requiring *before the magistrate* the execution of this law of retaliation upon those who might have become liable to its operation. They would thus evince a merciful and forgiving spirit, the peculiar ornament of the followers of Christ. — ¶ *Burning for burning*. That is, a brand-mark or stigma by hot iron or the like.

*Further Law respecting Injuries done to Servants.*

26, 27. *If a man smite the eye of his servant, &c.* Throughout these enactments it is easy to perceive that the condition of servitude among the Hebrews was marked by numerous benignant provisions, which no doubt went to render it more mild and tolerable than the same condition among any other people on earth. Here it is ordered that the loss of an eye or a tooth, through the undue violence of a master, should be compensated with the grant of liberty. Although the *eye* and the *tooth* only are mentioned, yet it is plainly to be inferred that the rule extended to every other instance of serious mutilation of the person. Moses frequently delivers general laws in the form of particular examples; and by here specifying the noblest of our organs on the one hand, and on the other one of those that can be most easily dispensed with, and are naturally lost on the coming of

28 ¶ If an ox gore a man or a woman, that they die: then <sup>z</sup> the ox shall be surely stoned, and his flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox *shall be quit*.

29 But if the ox were wont to push

<sup>z</sup> Gen. 9. 5.

old age, he plainly gives us to understand that all the other organs, of intermediate dignity, are to be included. It is also reasonable to suppose that all slaves, whether Israelites or not, were to have the benefit of this law, though the Jewish authorities restrict it to the former.

*Law respecting the pushing or goring Ox.*

28, 29. *If an ox gore a man or a woman.* The present is another characteristic feature of the Mosaic code. When a man, without having himself given the fatal blow, was, in consequence of gross carelessness, the cause of his neighbor's death in any other way, he became liable to the cognizance of the law. The case of the *pushing* ox is alone here mentioned, but there can be no doubt that the regulation applied to the case of any other animal capable of inflicting a mortal injury, whether by means of his horns, feet, teeth, or otherwise. 'The Scripture,' says Maimonides, 'speaketh not of the ox but as an instance.' The design of this law was to signify the divine detestation of homicide, and to inspire the nation of Israel with the deepest horror at every species of blood-shedding, by which human life was extinguished. At the same time the ancient Asiatic notions of retributive justice are clearly to be traced in the ordinances before us. Among a people more advanced in civilization and refinement a pecuniary or other penalty would have the effect of inspiring the due degree of caution in restraining noxious animals. But for a rude people like the Hebrews in the age

with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death.

of Moses, the present enactment, which inflicted punishment on the injurious beast itself, would probably be more effectual than any other in impressing their minds with a strong sense of the value of human life and the certain retribution that awaited its destroyer. Accordingly, many of the ancient legislators, who were called to institute laws to people placed in circumstances closely resembling those of the Hebrews, proceeded on the same principle as Moses; some of the wisest of them ordaining, that a dog that bit a person should be put in chains; and that if a stone, or piece of wood, iron, or the like, was thrown at a man, so as to kill him, but the perpetrator could not be discovered, the punishment appointed by the law should be forthwith inflicted on the instrument of the murder. In ancient history we read of a statue, which, by accident, had fallen down and killed a bystander, being thrown into the sea; and in modern history we meet with a singular instance of severity displayed towards a tree, in consequence of an atrocious robbery having been committed near it. Sir John Malcolm relates, that a late Persian monarch, who had signalised his reign by a laudable zeal to extirpate every species of crime, especially to make travelling through his dominions safe from the molestations of robbers, having been informed by an individual of his being waylaid and relieved of a considerable sum of money, issued a proclamation for the apprehension of the offenders. No clue, however, was found that could lead to the discovery; and the king, determined not to let such an atrocity



30 If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for <sup>a</sup> the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him.

31 Whether he have gored a son, or have gored a daughter, accord-

<sup>a</sup> ver. 22. Numb. 35. 31.

pass without a marked expression of his royal displeasure, sent a herald through all the neighboring towns and villages, to announce, that as the robbery was perpetrated at a certain tree, he had ordered the executioners of justice to repair on an appointed day to the spot, and punish the tree according to the utmost rigors of the law. At the period fixed, an immense crowd repaired to witness the spectacle; the royal messenger inflicted tremendous blows on the unconscious and unoffending tree; and the consequence was, that such a feeling was universally diffused among his subjects of the king's fixed determination to revenge the theft, that the delinquents, in the course of the next night, deposited the stolen property at the foot of the very tree at which they had taken it, and which had suffered for their crime. Instances of this description show us the wisdom and necessity of lawgivers accommodating their institutions and manner of procedure to the character and circumstances of the people over whom they preside. — π *His flesh shall not be eaten.* Both in order to inspire deeper detestation, and that the owner's loss might be greater. — π *The owner of the ox shall be quit.* Shall suffer no other punishment than the loss of his ox. This, however, was on condition of the owner's not having been previously acquainted with the vicious propensities of the animal. But if he had been informed of preceding instances of the same kind, and yet had neglected to take care of the ox, and through his neglect any one had lost his life, then not only must the ox be stoned, but the

ing to this judgment shall it be done unto him.

32 If the ox shall push a man-servant, or a maid-servant; he shall give unto their master <sup>b</sup> thirty

<sup>b</sup> See Zech. 11. 12, 13. Matt. 26. 15. Phil. 2. 7.

owner also punished as a murderer. Mischief of this kind was provided against by the statutes or customs of most nations, but by none so studiously as those of the Hebrews. The Romans twisted hay about the horns of their dangerous cattle, as a caution to all that came in their way. Hence the saying of Horace, '*Fœnum habet in cornu, longè fuge!*' *he has hay on his horns, flee for life!* But the Jewish law required the confinement of the beast.

30—32. *If there be laid on him a sum of money, &c.* Heb. *אם כבר ירשת עליו* *im kopher yushath alav, if an atonement, or ransom, be laid upon him.* This evidently supposes that in view of alleviating circumstances, the magistrates were permitted to change the punishment of death into a pecuniary mulct. The care of the ox, for instance, may have been committed to a careless servant; or he may have broken through the cords or the inclosure by which he was secured; or he might have been provoked and enraged by another; all which were circumstances that should go in mitigation of the sentence. Whatever the fine were in this case, he was to submit to it, and it was to be given to the heirs of him that had been killed. This fine, in the case of a free man or woman, was left discretionary with the judge, but in the case of a male or female servant was fixed to the sum of thirty shekels of silver, or about \$22 of our money. This valuation of a slave was precisely the sum for which Judas betrayed Christ! Mat. 26. 15. Zech. 11. 12, 13.—In v. 31, the Chal. has, 'A son of Israel or a daughter of Israel.'

shekels of silver, and the ox shall be stoned.

33 ¶ And if a man shall open a pit, or if a man shall dig a pit, and not cover it, and an ox or an ass fall therein ;

34 The owner of the pit shall make it good, and give money unto the owner of them ; and the dead beast shall be his.

35 ¶ And if one man's ox hurt another's that he die, then they shall sell the live ox, and divide the

c ver. 23.

money of it, and the dead ox also they shall divide.

36 Or if it be known that the ox hath used to push in time past, and his owner hath not kept him in ; he shall surely pay ox for ox, and the dead shall be his own.

#### CHAPTER XXII.

**I**F a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it : he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and a four sheep for a sheep.

<sup>a</sup> 2 Sam. 12. 6. Luke 19. 8. See Prov. 6. 31.

#### *Law respecting the Pit left uncovered.*

33. *If a man shall open a pit, &c.* Not only were the statutes of this divine code so framed as to guard against mischief and injury arising from malice, but also against that which might be occasioned by a culpable negligence. The pits or wells from which water was procured in those countries, though usually covered when not in use, yet were very liable to be left open, thus exposing to the utmost peril the lives or limbs of the animals that chanced to fall into them. The law contemplates the two cases of opening an old pit and digging a new one. The damage accruing in either case was to be made good by the opener or digger, to whom, however, the carcase of the dead animal was to be considered as belonging.

#### *Law respecting Injuries done to cattle.*

35. *If one man's ox hurt another's.* Where cattle fought and one killed another, the owners were to adjust the matter by selling the live ox and dividing the price equally between them, and also by making an equal division of the dead ox. But it is supposed in this case, that there had been no fault on the part of the owner of the slaying ox. On the other hand, if the animal was known to be of vicious propensities and his owner had not kept him in, it

was manifestly just that he should suffer for his negligence, and was consequently required to give up his live ox and take the dead one.

#### CHAPTER XXII.

#### *Law respecting Theft and Burglary.*

1. *If a man shall steal an ox, &c.* The protection of person and property from the force of the violent, and from the frauds of the dishonest, is one of the chief objects of all criminal law ; and this object is compassed, or at least aimed at, by means of punishments or penalties annexed to crime. Now certainly the most obvious, appropriate, and efficacious punishment for stealing is, that the thief should be compelled to restore many times the value of that which he had stolen ; and in this we find the principle of the ensuing statutes concerning theft. As the property of the ancient Israelites consisted mainly in cattle, it was very natural that the principles on which the magistrates were to proceed in determining cases of theft and robbery, should be shown in instances taken from this kind of possession. From this chapter it appears that the most gentle punishment of theft was *twofold restitution to the owner*, who thus obtained a profit for his risk or loss. This punishment was applicable to every case in which the article stolen

2 ¶ If a thief be found <sup>b</sup> breaking up, and be smitten that he

<sup>b</sup> Matt. 24. 43.

remained unaltered in the thief's possession; that is, was neither sold nor slaughtered. If however either of these were the case, and consequently all hope of repentance and voluntary restitution precluded, the punishment was more severe, being *fourfold restitution* in the case of a sheep or goat, and probably of other animals except an ox, where it was *fivefold*. This higher degree of penalty was annexed to the theft of oxen on account of their great value in the rural economy of the Israelites; for they used no horses in their husbandry. The ox did every thing on their farms. He plowed, he threshed out the corn, and he drew it when threshed to the barn or garner. If therefore the theft of an ox was more severely punished than that of any thing else, it was on the same principle on which an increase of punishment is inflicted for the crime of stealing from the farmer his plough, or any part of the apparatus belonging to it. It was, however, afterward enacted, Lev. 6. 4, 5, that if the thief were touched in conscience, and voluntarily confessed his crime and restored the stolen property, he should only be required to *add a fifth part to it*. Comp. Num. 5. 6, 7.

2. If a thief be found breaking up, &c. Heb. במחצות *bammahtereth*, in digging through. Gr. ἐν τῷ διορύγματι, *id.* That is, digging or breaking through a house, as the Chal. expressly renders it. In the eastern countries the walls of the houses are made very thick in order to shelter the inhabitants more effectually from the intense heat of the climate, and they are very frequently made of dried mud, laid in between upright and tranverse pieces of timber. Maundrell, speaking of Damascus, says, 'The streets here are narrow, as is usual in hot countries, and the houses are all

die, *there shall* <sup>c</sup> no blood be shed for him.

<sup>c</sup> Numb. 35. 27.

built on the outside of no better a material than either sun-burnt brick, or Flemish wall, daubed over in as coarse a manner as can be seen in the vilest cottages. From this dirty way of building, they experience this amongst other inconveniences, that upon any violent rain the whole city becomes, by the washing of the houses, as it were a quagmire.' As an opening therefore was effected through dried clay, and not through wood or stone, we perceive the propriety of the terms employed. The phraseology may be illustrated by the following parallel passages: Job, 24. 16, 'In the dark they dig through houses which they had marked for themselves in the daytime.' Ezek. 8. 8, 'Then said he unto me, Son of Man, dig now in the wall,' &c. Mat. 24. 43, 'If the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief had come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up.' Gr. 'To be digged through.' It is plain also from the sequel that the burglary is supposed to be committed at night.—¶ No blood for him; as it reads without the italics. Heb. אין לו דמים *ain lo damim*, no bloods to him. That is, no blood shall be imputed to him who killed him; he shall not be held guilty of murder, inasmuch as it could not be known in the dark who the intruder was, or how far his designs might have carried him if not prevented. Gr. οὐκ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ φόνος, *there shall not be slaughter for him*. Chal., Sam., and Vulg. 'The smiter shall not be guilty of blood.' Syr. 'He shall not have an action of life.' Arab. 'His blood shall be unpunished.' The propriety of this enactment will appear more obvious if it be considered that in the night season men are less upon their guard, and where the precautions are

3 If the sun be risen upon him *there shall be blood shed* for him: for he should make full restitution; if he have nothing, then he shall be <sup>d</sup> sold for his theft.

4 If the theft be certainly <sup>e</sup> found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep; he shall <sup>f</sup> restore double.

5 ¶ If a man shall cause a field or

<sup>d</sup> ch. 21. 2. <sup>e</sup> ch. 21. 16. <sup>f</sup> See ver 1. 7. Prov. 6. 31.

necessarily slight, the rigor of the law should be increased. Besides, a robbery committed in the dead of night, when no spectators are by, is attended with great inconvenience for the want of witnesses, by whose testimony only the thief could be condemned. The case was directly the reverse provided the sun had risen, for then the presumption was that the thief's sole purpose was to steal and not to kill, and slaying was not the punishment for stealing. In God's code punishment is always duly proportioned to crime; and it teaches us to be tender of the lives of bad men.

3. *If the sun be risen upon him.* Chal. 'If the eye of witnesses shall have fallen upon him.' Targ. Jon. 'If it be clear by the sun's light that he did not enter for the purpose of killing.'—¶ *He should make full restitution.* This clause is designed as a statement of the reason for what goes before. The killing of the man under such circumstances were a mere act of wanton homicide, inasmuch as he could, if spared, have made complete restitution; or if too poor for this, he could have been sold as a slave, according to law, and the avails have gone to compensate the theft or the injury.—¶ *Then he shall be sold.* An unhappy rendering when strictly considered, for the housebreaker is supposed to be killed; and if so, how could he be sold as a slave? The version ought properly to have run like

vineyard to be eaten, and shall put in his beast, and shall feed in another man's field: of the best of his own field, and of the best of his own vineyard shall he make restitution.

6 ¶ If fire break out, and catch in thorns, so that the stacks of corn, or the standing corn, or the field be consumed *therewith*; he that kindled the fire shall surely make restitution.

the preceding, 'he *should* or *might* have been sold.'

4. *If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, &c.* This is not to be understood as being at variance with what is said Prov. 6. 31, 'If he be found, he shall restore *sevenfold*;' as the 'sevenfold' here is doubtless but another term for *abundantly*, according to the common usage of the number 'seven.' Comp. Gen. 4. 24. Ps. 12. 6.—79. 12. The provision in this case seems to be based upon a mild construction of motives. The theft being found in his hand would appear to argue more hesitation and less management and decision in iniquitous practices than if he had proceeded to kill or sell it. So nice are the discriminations that are made in this wonderful code.

#### *Law respecting Trespass.*

5. *If a man shall cause a field or vineyard, &c.* This was a case of trespass upon another man's grounds, where the intruder sent in his cattle to feed upon and eat down the grass, vines, or fruit trees of his neighbor. The penalty was that he should make restitution of the best of his own.

#### *Law respecting Conflagrations.*

6. *If a fire break out, and catch in thorns, &c.* It is a plain principle running through these enactments, that men should suffer for their carelessness, as well as for their wickedness; that they

are to consider themselves accountable not only for the injury they *do*, but also for that which they *occasion* through inadvertency. Here it is not necessary to suppose that he who kindled the fire *designed* the mischief that ensued. As it is a common custom in the East to set the dry herbage on fire before the descent of the autumnal rains, the fire may have been kindled on a man's own ground and by his own hand, and from want of proper attention it may have spread, and been productive of the widest ravages over the neighboring possessions. An adequate restitution is all the penalty enjoined in such a case of accidental conflagration; whereas for *wilfully* and *maliciously* kindling a destructive fire a much severer punishment was undoubtedly to be inflicted. The danger to property and loss of life arising from this source is strikingly depicted in the following note on this passage in the Pictorial Bible. 'This (law) doubtless alludes to the common practice in the East of setting fire to the dry herbage, before the commencement of the autumnal rains, under the very correct impression that this operation is favorable to the next crop. The herbage is so perfectly dry by the long summer droughts, that the fire when kindled often spreads to a great extent and cannot be checked while it finds any aliment. The operation is attended with great danger, and requires to be performed with a careful reference to the direction in which the wind blows, and to local circumstances, that nothing valuable may be consumed in the course given to the destructive element. Such a fire kindled accidentally or wilfully is sometimes attended with most calamitous consequences, destroying trees, shrubs, and standing crops, and placing in considerable danger persons who happen to be abroad on a journey or otherwise. Such accidents sometimes happen through the carelessness of travellers in neglecting, when they leave their sta-

tions, to extinguish the fires they have used during the night. The dry herbage towards the end of summer is so very combustible, that a slight cause is sufficient to set it in a blaze. Dr. Chandler relates an anecdote, which sufficiently shows the necessity and propriety of the law which the text brings to our notice. When he was taking a plan of Troas, one day after dinner, a Turk came near and emptied the ashes out of his pipe. A spark fell unobserved upon the grass, and a brisk wind soon kindled a blaze, which withered in an instant the leaves of the trees and bushes in its way, seized the branches and roots, and devoured all before it with prodigious crackling and noise. Chandler and his party were much alarmed, as a general conflagration of the country seemed likely to ensue: but after an hour's exertion they were enabled to extinguish the flames. The writer of this note can himself recollect, that when one chilly night he assisted in kindling a fire, for warmth, on the western bank of the Tigris, so much alarm was exhibited by the Arabs lest the flames should catch the tamarisks and other shrubs and bushes which skirt the river, that the party were induced to forego the enjoyment which the fire afforded. The writer has often witnessed these fires, and the appearance which they present, particularly at night, was always very striking. The height of the flame depends upon the thickness and strength of its aliment; and its immediate activity, upon the force of the wind. When there is little or no wind the fire has no other food than the common herbage of the desert or steppe; the flame seldom exceeds three feet in height, and advances slowly and steadily like a vast tide of fire backed by the smoke of the smouldering embers, and casting a strong light for a considerable height into the air, sometimes also throwing up a taller mass of flame where it meets with clumps of bushes or shrubs which

7 ¶ If a man shall deliver unto his neighbour money or stuff to keep, and it be stolen out of the man's house; g if the thief be found, let him pay double.

8 If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto the h judges, to see whether he have put his hand unto his neighbour's goods.

9 For all manner of trespass, whether it be for ox, for ass, for sheep, for raiment, or for any manner of lost thing which another chal-lengeth to be his: the i cause of both parties shall come before the judges; and whom the judges shall

g ver. 4. h ch. 21. 6. & ver. 28. i Dent. 25. 1. 2 Chron. 19. 10.

afford more substantial aliment. This taller mass lingers behind to complete its work after the general body of flame has continued its destructive and conquering march. A high wind throws the flames forward with great fury, while, if the ground happens to be thickly set with clumps of bushes, the tall columns of flame which start up in the advancing fiery tide, give increased intensity to the grand and appalling effect of one of the most remarkable scenes which it falls to the lot of a traveller to witness. In the steppes of southern Russia the writer has passed over tracts of ground, the surface of which had, for fifty miles or more, been swept and blackened by the flames.' *Pict. Bible*.

#### Law respecting Deposits.

7. If a man shall deliver unto his neighbor money or stuff to keep. Heb. כֶּסֶף אוֹ כֵּלִים *keseph o k'ilim, silver or vessels*; i. e. furniture, utensils. Perhaps the general word *articles* comes the nearest to the original. When valuable *articles* were left for safe keeping in the hands of any one, and while thus entrusted were in some way missing, if the thief were found he was to restore

condemn he shall pay double unto his neighbour.

10 If a man deliver unto his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast to keep; and it die, or be hurt, or driven away, no man seeing it:

11 Then shall an k oath of the Lord be between them both, that he hath not put his hand unto his neighbour's goods; and the owner of it shall accept thereof, and he shall not make it good.

12 And l if it be stolen from him, he shall make restitution unto the owner thereof.

13 If it be torn in pieces; then let him bring it for witness, and he

k Hebr. 6. 16. l Gen. 31. 39.

double. But if the thief were not found, there was at least a suspicion that he who had them in keeping had secreted or abstracted them, and a judicial inquiry was thereupon to be instituted. The depositary was to be summoned before the magistrates and his oath that he knew nothing of them was to be considered as a full acquittance. The law indeed does not expressly mention the oath, but only says, 'he shall be brought unto the judges (אֱלֹהִים *Elohim, gods*), to see whether not (לֹא אִם *im lo*) he hath put his hand, &c.:' but the phrase לֹא אִם *im lo, whether not*, is elsewhere so notoriously the usual formula of an oath among the Hebrews, that we can scarcely understand it otherwise than in reference to an oath; more especially as the oath is distinctly mentioned v. 11, and in most cases no other proof of his not having retained his neighbor's property could possibly be had. This is confirmed by some of the ancient versions, as Vulg. 'And shall swear that he hath not put his hand to his neighbor's goods.' Sept. and Sam. 'Shall come before God and swear that he hath not been wicked in the whole trust of his neighbor.'

9—13. For ox, for ass, for sheep.

shall not make good that which was torn.

14 ¶ And if a man borrow *aught* of his neighbour, and it be hurt, or

The rule in the preceding verse has respect to articles of money, plate, or furniture; but in the present to *live stock* intrusted to the care of another 'to keep;' i. e. not gratuitously, as in the case above, v. 7, but for hire or upon certain considerations, as Jacob had Laban's flock to keep, Gen. 30. 31—36. That this is the true sense may be inferred from the nature of the case. The keeping of money, jewels, &c. required no care or labor, but simply a *safe place* of deposit, and therefore might be gratuitous; but not so with cattle or sheep, which must of course be fed and pastured, and would thus incur expense. If the deposit consisted of any of the animals here mentioned, and it met with any injury, or was driven away from the pasture, the depositary, if no man had seen it, was obliged to swear he had not retained it, nor applied it to his own use; and his oath to this effect the owner was bound to accept instead of payment. But if, on the other hand, it had been stolen out of the house of the depositary, he was obliged to pay for it; inasmuch as a theft in such circumstances would imply the most criminal remissness in him in whose house it had occurred, and it was just that he should suffer the loss of it. If, again, the beast was torn to pieces, the depositary was only bound to bring proof of the fact, and doing so he was under no obligation to make it good. What proof was requisite Moses does not say. The most natural proof would of course be the testimony of an eye-witness, or a remnant of the bloody skin, or carcase; Jerus. Targ. 'Let him bring of the members of it for a witness that it is killed.' But on this point nothing is specified in the text.—¶ *An oath of the Lord.* So called because to Him

die, the owner thereof *being* not with it, he shall surely make it good.

15 *But* if the owner thereof *be*

the appeal was made, not only as to a Witness of truth, but as to an Avenger of falsehood and wrong. Even in the case of one who had so far broken through the bonds of moral restraint, as to offer injury to his neighbor, it might still be presumed that there was so much regard to conscience as to prevent him from profaning 'an oath of the Lord,' and calling the God of truth to be a witness to a lie.

#### *Law respecting Things borrowed.*

14, 15. *If a man borrow aught of his neighbor, &c.* In the case of a borrowed beast of burden, as an ox, an ass, or a horse, receiving any hurt, or coming by his death, the borrower was to make it good, provided the owner were not present; for it might be fairly presumed that he had injured or destroyed it by excessive labor or other cruelty. But if the owner himself were present, he would of course be presumed to have done his best to preserve it, and would at any rate be a witness to the fact, and to its not being owing to the negligence or any other fault of the borrower; consequently as the latter was not required in equity to make it good, so neither in law. As to the final clause, 'If it be an hired thing, it came for his hire,' it seems to indicate a distinction between things lent for hire, and those lent *gratis* for good will, the preceding rule applying only to the latter; whereas in the former, whether the owner were present or not, the borrower was not required to make restitution, unless indeed the owner could prove that the loss was occasioned by his culpable maltreatment or neglect. When this was not the case, but the thing were borrowed on the condition of the borrower's paying so much for the use of

with it, he shall not make *it* good : if it *be* a hired *thing*, it came for his hire.

16 ¶ And <sup>m</sup> if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

<sup>m</sup> Deut. 22. 28, 29.

it, then the loss was not to be made good ; 'it came for his hire ;' i. e. the loss was to be considered as balanced by the profit of the hire. The compensation agreed upon was to be regarded as an offset to the hazard run by the owner in letting out his property ; and with such a risk in view he would naturally fix his price accordingly. The more these statutes are examined, the more clearly does their reasonable, equitable, mild, and humane spirit appear.

#### *Law respecting Seduction.*

16. *If a man entice a maid, &c.* Heb. יִפְחַתֵּהּ *yephatteh*, *enticingly persuade*. It is assumed that no *force* was used, but merely *persuasions* and *blandishments*; and that the young woman was not betrothed to another. This differs the present from the case supposed Deut. 22. 28, where it is to be understood, both that the maid was betrothed, and that some degree of violence was used. See Note in loc. The penalty prescribed for the seducer in the present case, was that he should 'endow her to be his wife,' i. e. marry her and provide for her suitably according to his station. If, however, the father did not choose to let him have her, still the seducer was obliged to pay a certain sum of money as a compensation for the injury. The amount prescribed is no more definitely fixed than by the terms, 'he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.' That is, according to their rank and condition in life ; having respect to their parentage, connexions, and prospects ; as a

17 If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the <sup>n</sup> dowry of virgins.

18 ¶ ° Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.

<sup>n</sup> Gen. 34. 12. Deut. 22. 29. 1 Sam. 18. 25.  
<sup>o</sup> Lev. 19. 26, 31. & 20. 27. Deut. 18. 10, 11.  
1 Sam. 28. 3, 9.

maid in humble circumstances could not reasonably look for so ample a dowry as one of a wealthy or distinguished family. It has indeed been supposed that this was a stated mulct of fifty shekels, but the passage from which this conclusion is drawn (Deut. 22. 28, 29.) refers to a *rape*, and not to simple seduction.—It might appear perhaps at first view that the law by merely appointing to the seducer marriage with the partner of his crime, and exempting her from punishment altogether, was too mild and lenient for such an offence. But it is to be considered that the woman suffered the corporeal and visible consequences, and the public disgrace of illicit intercourse ; and as to the man, although he did indeed satisfy the civil law by marrying and endowing the victim of his lust, yet in the sight of God he was not cleared from the guilt of his sin by this mode of making amends, but needed the cleansing of deep repentance before he could obtain absolution from his Judge.

#### *Law respecting Witchcraft.*

18. *Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.* That is, a reputed or professed witch ; a woman who practised such magical arts, incantations, and sorceries, as gave her the reputation of being a witch. The use of the term, however, determines nothing as to the *reality* of the preternatural power to which such persons laid claim. The Scriptures are wont, in multitudes of instances, to speak of things not according to their absolute verity, but according to general impression and belief.



The remark of some commentators, that 'if there had been no *witches* such a law as this had never been made'—'that the existence of the *law*, given under the direction of the Spirit of God, proves the existence of the *thing*'—is founded upon a very inadequate view of the general structure of revelation. The sacred writers speak of *false gods*, for instance, as if they were *real existences*, but we see at once how gross would be the error of such an interpretation. So likewise in regard to witchcraft, and all those arts and incantations which are based upon a supposed commerce with evil spirits. We do not consider the assumption of the *reality* of such intercourse as at all necessary to the true explication of the passages in which it seems to be implied, nor to the enactment of such laws as that under consideration. Pretended arts of this nature were common among all the idolatrous nations of antiquity, and from their intimate connexion with idolatrous rites and systems, were obviously fraught with the most pernicious effects when introduced among the chosen people, who were at best but too much addicted to superstitious practices. However false and futile in themselves, they did, in fact, involve a deep offence against the very first principles of the Mosaic dispensation, and this accounts for the severity with which they were treated by its laws. They were not only built upon systems of theology that were at war with the doctrines and worship of the Theocracy, but by imposing upon the credulity and exciting the terrors of the vulgar, they gave to individuals a very dangerous power, in a society so singularly constituted as that of the Hebrews. The practising of these arts was forbidden therefore under the severest penalties, as the mischief actually wrought was about equal, whether the supernatural power professed were a reality or a mere imposture.

This is sufficient to justify the law as here and elsewhere enounced, *under the circumstances in which it was given*, but as the subject is somewhat curious and interesting, we shall devote a little more time to the consideration of the import of the term here and elsewhere employed to designate the class of persons against whom this law is so emphatically directed. From the annexed passage, occurring Deut. 18. 9—14, it is perhaps to be inferred that the practice thus severely denounced was not one which had hitherto been common among the chosen people, but was one which they were in danger of learning from the heathen inhabitants of Canaan; 'When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that *useth divination*, or an *observer of times*, or an *enchanter*, or a *witch*, or a *charmer*, or a *consulter with familiar spirits*, or a *wizard*, or a *necromancer*. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord: and because of these abominations the Lord your God doth drive them out from before thee. Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God. For these nations, which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and unto diviners; but as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee so to do.'

In the passage which we are now considering the original term is מְכַשֵּׁפָה *mekashshephah*, the fem. of מְכַשֵּׁף *mekashsheph*, usually rendered *magician* or *sorcerer*. As to the primitive and most elementary sense of the root כָּשַׁף *kashaph*, it is a point which philology has not yet clearly determined. Michaelis refers to what he considers the cognate Arabic root *kasapha*, signifying *to cut*, whence in the time of a solar or lunar eclipse they are wont to say, 'God

*cuts* the sun or the moon ;' from a part of the luminary's appearing to be *cut off* from the remainder. Accordingly eclipses of the sun or moon are called in that language 'kusuph,' *cutting* ; while our term *eclipse* comes from a Greek word signifying *fainting* or *failing*. Taking this derivation as a basis, Michaelis supposes that the word, in biblical usage, which had respect to the absurd and superstitious notions of the times, denotes *a person who occasions solar or lunar eclipses* ; that is, from his astronomical knowledge of their approach ; making all manner of grimaces, singing songs, and so affecting to *enchant* the heavenly bodies. This, he says, corresponds with the ancient rabbinical notions of witchcraft, which was a kind of unhallowed perversion or falsification of the powers of nature, causing them to operate contrary to the true meant designs of their author. This etymology, like hundreds of others which depend upon the affinities of Arabic and Hebrew, though possibly correct, cannot be *verified*, and we are in fact thrown back upon the biblical use of the Piel form of the verb, which is universally rendered to *practise prestige*, to *use incantations*, *magic*, *sorcery*, in a word, to *resort to the arts of witchcraft*. The Greek renders it by *φαρμακους*, *poisoners*, probably because these sorcerers dealt much in *drugs* or *pharmaceutical potions*, to which potent effects were ascribed, and which were often deleterious. But it does not appear that this is a fair representation of the force of the original term. As the female sex were supposed to be more especially addicted to this kind of forbidden craft, the word here occurs in the feminine, and is rendered by a term which perhaps conveys the most adequate notion of the original. Our English word *witch* is supposed to be derived from the verb *to wit* (anciently *to weet*, i. e. to know) through its adjective form *wittigh* or *wittich*, afterwards

contracted to *witch*. A *witch*, therefore, in its etymological import, is a *knowing woman*, as *wizard* (*wise-ard*) is also a *knowing, cunning, or wise man*. But the *knowledge* implied by the terms is of a peculiar kind—a knowledge of occult and mysterious things—a skill in disclosing or foretelling matters that lie beyond the reach of ordinary human intelligence, and supposed to be acquired by means of an express or implicit compact with some evil spirit. Persons of this imputed character were accordingly invested, by popular belief, with the power of altering, in many instances, the course of nature's immutable laws, of raising winds and storms, of riding through the air, of transforming themselves into various shapes, of afflicting and tormenting those who had rendered themselves obnoxious to them, with acute pains and lingering diseases ; in short, to do whatever they pleased, through the agency of the devil, who was supposed to be always obsequious to their beck and bidding. The belief in the reality of witchcraft, clothed with this kind of supernatural attributes, has been more or less prevalent in all ages and countries, and in periods of abounding ignorance and superstition, the most cruel laws have been framed against its alleged professors, and multitudes of innocent persons, male and female, many of them aged, poor, friendless, decrepid, and sick, condemned and burnt for powers they never possessed, and for crimes they neither premeditated nor committed. Happily for humanity, these sanguinary laws have been mostly abolished from the codes of enlightened modern nations, and the prevention or cure of the evils of magical imposture left to the progress of general intelligence, of science, and instructed piety among all classes. The faith in oracles and miracles, the legends of superstition, and the creations of distempered fancy have died away in Christian countries before the ad-

19 ¶ Whosoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to death.

P Lev. 18. 23. & 20. 15.

vancing light of revelation, and little children retire to bed without alarm, and people traverse unfrequented paths at all hours and seasons without the dread of witches or ghosts, of spells or incantations. For our highly favored exemption from these pernicious forms of superstitious belief, though they have indeed sadly darkened one period of the annals of our own country, we can never be sufficiently grateful.—¶ *Shall not suffer to live.* Heb. לֹא תַחְיֶה *lo tehayeh*, lit. *shalt not vivify*. On the peculiar usage of this term we have elsewhere commented. See Note on Gen. 6. 19. Josh. 6. 25. It implies in some way a *saving, preserving, continuing in life*, after a *virtual extinction*; and the import may be, that inasmuch as a practiser of witchcraft is to be considered as *ipso facto* condemned to death by the law without any previous formality of trial or judicial sentence; the forbearing to execute such an offender was a kind of *reanimation* or *resuscitation* of him or her in direct contravention of the divine statute. This is, perhaps, the most plausible solution of a phraseology of which Michaelis intimates that it occasioned him no little difficulty, as the usual mode of expression in the Levitical penal statutes is מוֹת יָמוּת *moth yamuth*, *he or she dying shall die, shall die the death*, instead of *shall not be suffered to live*. But his proposal to read לֹא תִהְיֶה *shall not be*, is supported by no authority whatever; and our interpretation renders it unnecessary.

#### *Law respecting Beastiality.*

19. *Whosoever lieth, &c.* This was a crime of such crying enormity that the earth itself was defiled by bearing such a monster of impurity as its perpetrator, and he was at once to be cut

20 ¶ He that sacrificeth unto

q Numb. 25. 2, 7, 8. Deut. 13. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 15. & 17. 2, 3, 5.

off from among the living without mercy. From a comparison of this passage with Lev. ch. 18. 20, it appears that this was one of the prevalent abominations of the Canaanites, from which the Israelites were to shrink with a holy horror, and in order to deepen the impression of its ineffable turpitude and atrocity, the abused beast was to be involved in the doom of the more brute-like offender.

#### *Law respecting Idolatrous Sacrifices.*

20. *He that sacrificeth, &c.* This is clearly the sin prohibited in the first commandment of the Decalogue, but it is enumerated also under the *judicial laws*, and marked with the punishment of death, not only because it was a high handed moral offence, but also a crime against the state. Under the theocracy, as we have before remarked, God was the national king of Israel, and idolatry being the virtual acknowledgment of another sovereign, was of course, to be accounted as nothing less than downright rebellion or treason against the supreme authority. Sacrificing, being the principal act of religious worship among the heathen, is selected as the *overt* act of idolatry, which constituted the capital offence; although under this name are doubtless included the various idolatrous services specified in the parallel law, Deut. 17. 2—5.—¶ *Shall be utterly destroyed.* Heb. יִהְיֶה יָחֵר *yohoram*, *anathematized*, i. e. *destroyed as execrable and accursed*, put to death without mercy, as the original הָרַם *herem*, *a devoted thing, an anathema*, implies. Gr. ἐξολοθρευθήσεται, *shall be destroyed*. Chal. ‘*Shall be killed.*’ Targ. Jon. ‘*Shall be killed with the sword and his goods consumed.*’ This law, however, is understood by the Hebrew canonists of a knowing and wilful idolater, such an one as is de-

any god, save unto the LORD only, he shall be utterly destroyed.

21 ¶ <sup>r</sup> Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.

22 ¶ <sup>s</sup> Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child.

<sup>r</sup> ch. 23. 9. Lev. 19. 33. & 25. 35. Deut. 10. 19. Jer. 7. 6. Zech. 7. 10. Mal. 3. 5. <sup>s</sup> Deut. 10. 18. & 24. 17. & 27. 19. Ps. 94. 6. Isai. 1. 17, 23. & 10. 2. Ezek. 22. 7. Zech. 7. 10. James 1. 27.

scribed Num. 15. 27, 30, as sinning 'with a high hand.' They thus speak of it; 'Whoso serveth idols willingly and presumptuously, he is exposed to cutting off (i. e. by the secret stroke of God); and if there be witnesses that have seen him, he is to be stoned to death. But if he have served them ignorantly, he is to bring the sin-offering appointed therefor.'

*Law respecting the Treatment of the Stranger, the Widow, and the Fatherless.*

21. *Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor, &c.* Heb. תִּנְהוּ *toneh*, afflict, distress. The distinction made by the Jewish critics between 'vex' and 'oppress' is, that the former refers to upbraiding and opprobrious words, while the latter points to injurious, oppressive, and cruel actions, more especially in matters of traffic and other business transactions. By 'stranger,' here is not meant a transient passenger through the territories of the Israelites, but a permanent sojourner; though not an owner of land. That such foreign residents dwelt among the chosen people is evident from numerous passages, and as the somewhat exclusive genius of the Hebrew polity might tend to subject them to vexatious or humiliating treatment, God saw fit to protect them by several different statutes. Accordingly we frequently find them conjoined with other classes of mankind that are specially entitled to compassion, as the

23 If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry;

24 And my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword; and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless.

<sup>t</sup> Deut. 15. 9. & 24. 15. Job 35. 9. Luke 18. 7. <sup>u</sup> ver. 23. Job 34. 28. Ps. 18. 6. & 145. 19. James 5. 4. <sup>x</sup> Job 31. 23. Ps. 69. 24. <sup>y</sup> Ps. 109. 9. Lam. 5. 3.

poor, the widow, and the orphan. It was in fact an object of heaven to allure strangers by kind usage to live among the Israelites, provided they did not practice idolatry or violate the laws; and in order that they might be induced to think favorably of the true religion and at length to embrace it, they were to be exempted from any such harsh or harrassing treatment as would tend to harden their minds in prejudice or drive them back among idolaters. The duty of thus behaving kindly to strangers is enforced by reminding the Israelites of their having been themselves once strangers, and nothing is plainer than that our own experience of privation and distress should school us to a lively sympathy with the like suffering of our fellow-creatures. The oppression of strangers may well be termed 'an Egyptian sin, deserving of Egyptian plagues.'

22—24. *Ye shall not afflict any widow, &c.* In these verses the humane and compassionate spirit of the Mosaic law shines very conspicuous. Jehovah here avows himself the husband of the widow and the father of the orphan. He virtually says of himself, what is emphatically affirmed by the Psalmist, Ps. 68. 5, 'A father of the fatherless and a judge of the widow, is God in his holy habitation.' In thus forbidding his people to afflict widows and orphans he does in fact enjoin it upon them to comfort and assist them, and to be ready on all occasions to show them kindness.

25 ¶ *z* If thou lend money to *any*

*z* Lev. 25. 35, 36, 37. Deut. 23. 19, 20. Neh. 5. 7. Ps. 15. 5. Ezek. 18. 8, 17.

Being deprived in the providence of God of their natural guardians, and being themselves unversed in business, and of a timorous and tender spirit, their destitute condition laid them peculiarly open to the deceitful arts, impositions, and oppression of unprincipled men. And although no one could take an unrighteous advantage of these circumstances without doing violence to some of the strongest instinctive impulses in his own breast, yet God is pleased by this law to give additional force to the native sentiments of compassion and kindness which might be supposed to operate in favor of the friendless and fatherless. He declares that their case shall come under his particular cognizance. If any hardship is put upon them from which a husband and a father would have sheltered them, he will interpose and act the part of a vindicator and protector. Having no one else to complain and appeal to, if they cry unto him he will assuredly hear and avenge them. If men will not pity them, he will. And this no doubt accounts for the fact that no particular penalty is prescribed for the violation of this statute. God himself undertakes to avenge their cause by the retributions of his providence; and nothing could more impressively show the divine abhorrence of the sin. It was no common sin, and therefore was to be punished in no common way. The equity of the sentence denounced is too obvious to be overlooked. The oppressors of widows and orphans shall be punished in kind; *their* wives shall become widows, and their children fatherless. And even at the present day the judgments of heaven upon this class of men are strikingly analogous to what is here threatened. Those whom God makes his especial

of my people *that is* poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury.

charge can never be injured or assailed with impunity. Let the parallel monition therefore of the wise man be reverently regarded, Prov. 23. 10, 11, 'Remove not the old landmark; and enter not into the fields of the fatherless; for their Redeemer is mighty; he shall plead their cause with thee.'

#### *Law respecting Usury and Pledge.*

25. *If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee.* Rather, according to the letter of the original, 'If thou lend money to my people, *even* to a poor man with thee.' The Israelites were a people but little engaged in commerce, and therefore could not in general be supposed to borrow money but from sheer necessity; and of that necessity the lender was not to take advantage by usurious exactions. The law is not to be understood as a prohibition of *interest* at any rate whatever, but of *excessive interest* or *usury*. The clause, 'Thou shalt not be to him as an usurer,' is equivalent to saying, 'Thou shalt not domineer and lord it over him rigorously and cruelly.' That this class of men were peculiarly prone to be extortionate and oppressive in their dealings with debtors would seem to be implied by the etymology of the original term for *usury* (נֶשֶׁק *neshek*), which comes from a root signifying *to bite*; and in Neh. 5. 2—5, we have a remarkable case of the bitter and grinding effects resulting from the exercise of the creditor's rights over the debtor. A large portion of the people had not only mortgaged their lands, vineyards, and houses, but had actually sold their sons and daughters into bondage to satisfy the claims of their grasping creditors. In this emergency Nehemiah espoused the cause of the poor, and compelled the rich, against

26<sup>a</sup> If thou at all take thy neighbour's raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the sun goeth down :

27 For that is his covering only,

<sup>a</sup> Deut. 24. 6, 10, 13, 17. Job 22. 6. & 24. 3, 9. Prov. 20. 16. & 22. 27. Ezek. 18. 7, 16. Amos 2. 8.

whom he called the people together, to remit the whole of their dues, and moreover exacted from them an oath that they would never afterwards press their poor brethren for the payment of those debts. This was not because every part of those proceedings had been contrary to the letter of the Mosaic law, but because it was a flagrant breach of equity under the circumstances. It was taking a cruel and barbarous advantage of the necessities of their brethren at which God was highly indignant, and which his servants properly rebuked. From this law the Hebrew canonists have gathered as a general rule, that 'whoso exacteth of a poor man, and knoweth that he hath not aught to pay him with, he transgresseth against this prohibition, Thou shalt not be to him as an exacting creditor.' (*Maimonides in Ainsworth*). We no where learn from the institutes delivered by Moses that the simple taking of interest, especially from the neighboring nations, Deut. 23. 19, 20, was forbidden to the Israelites, but the divine law would give no countenance to the griping and extortionate practices to which miserly money-lenders are always prone. The deserving and industrious poor might sometimes be reduced to such straits that pecuniary accommodations might be very desirable to them, and toward such God would inculcate a mild, kind, and forbearing spirit, and the precept is enforced by the relation which they sustained to him; q. d., 'Remember that you are lending to *my* people, *my* poor, and therefore take no advantage of their necessities. Trust me against the fear

it is his raiment for his skin : wherein shall he sleep? and it shall come to pass, when he<sup>b</sup> crieth unto me, that I will hear; for I *am*<sup>c</sup> gracious.

<sup>b</sup> ver. 23. <sup>c</sup> ch. 34. 6. 2 Chron. 30. 9. Ps. 86. 15.

of loss, and treat them kindly and generously.'

26, 27. *If thou at all take thy neighbor's raiment to pledge, &c.* 'This passage, which describes a poor man as sleeping at night in his outer garment, exhibits one of the many unchanged customs of the East. The orientals generally, of whatever rank, do not undress at night. They merely throw off their outer and looser robes, unwind their turbans and vast waist-cloth, sleeping in their caps, shirt, drawers, waistcoat, and gown. The common people very often do not sleep at all in what we should call a bed. The details of their management of course depend much on the particular costume of the country; but, speaking generally, a poor man is quite content to make his cloak and waist-cloth serve for a bed, lying on one of the two and covering himself with the other, or else making the cloak or the girdle alone serve all his purposes. A mat, rug, or piece of carpet is all he desires to render his bed more luxurious. These observations particularly apply to the Bedouin Arabs, although true also of other Asiatic countries, and is not peculiar to Asia, for, while travelling in Russia, we have often, on passing through towns and villages at night or early in the morning, seen great numbers of men lying about on the ground wrapped up in their sheepskin cloaks. The poor desert Arab, whose dress is little more than a shirt and a woollen mantle, is content to use the latter for his bed and bed-clothes when he has nothing better;—drawing it over his head—for an Arab al-

28 ¶ <sup>d</sup> Thou shalt not revile the

<sup>d</sup> Eccles. 10. 20. Acts 23. 5. Jude 8.

ways covers his head whether he sleeps by day or night—and gathering up his feet, he sleeps with as much apparent ease and comfort as on a down-bed, his tough frame seeming quite unconscious of the hardness of the ground and the asperities of its surface. There is no people of the East whose costume seems to have remained with so little alteration from the most ancient times as that of the inhabitants of the Arabian deserts; or which is so susceptible of being, in most cases, identified with the dress worn by the ancient Jews. We should therefore, perhaps, not be much mistaken in considering the garment of the text as nearly resembling the simple woollen mantle of the present Arabs. It is nearly square, reaching from the shoulders to the calf of the leg, or even to the ancles, and about as wide as long. A square sack, having in front a slit from top to bottom, a hole at the top for the neck, and a slit on each side for the arms, would give a good idea of this shapeless but useful article of dress. Garments of the kind indicated are of various qualities and texture. Some are very light and fine, with embroidery in silk, silver, or gold, or gold on the breast and between the shoulders; but the common sort are coarse and heavy, commonly with alternate stripes, a foot wide, of blue and white, or brown and white, but frequently all black or brown. This robe, called an *abba*, is commonly worn loosely on the shoulders, as the Irish peasantry wear their great coats; but when active exertion is required it is either thrown aside, or is drawn close around the body and fastened by a girdle, the arms being then necessarily thrust through the arm-holes. This article of dress is certainly as indispensable to a poor Arab, as the garment of the text could be to a poor Jew.' *Pict. Bible*.—¶ *Thou shalt deliver it unto*

gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people.

*him by that the sun goeth down.* But it may be asked whether a formal law would be framed in respect to articles given in pledge but *for a single day*? The implication undoubtedly is, that the pledge was restored *for the night only*, and was returned to the creditor *by day*. Here again the Hebrew canons opportunely offer their deductions. 'When one takes a pledge of his neighbor, if he be a poor man, and his pledge be a thing that he hath need of, it is commanded that he restore the pledge at the time when he needeth it. He is to restore him his bedding at night, that he may sleep on it, and his working-tools by day, that he may do his work with them. If he do not restore the instruments of the day by day, and the instruments of the night by night, he transgresseth against the prohibition, Thou shalt not sleep with his pledge, Deut. 24. 12. (*Maimonides in Ainsworth*).

#### *Law respecting the Contempt of Authority.*

28. *Thou shalt not revile the gods.* Heb. אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*; i. e. the judges, rulers, magistrates. See Note on Ex. 21. 6. Thus Eccl. 10. 20, 'Curse not the king; no, not in thy thought.' Yet it is remarkable that both Philo and Josephus understand this precept as prohibiting the blaspheming or reviling of the gods of the heathen. The former thinks that the Deity should be to us an object of such sacred veneration, that we ought not even to blaspheme what is erroneously accounted divine; and that the heathen would, out of zeal and by way of retaliation, blaspheme the true God, if he heard the Jew blaspheming his gods. The latter, in detailing, in his 'Antiquities,' the laws of Moses, quotes this as one of them; 'No man shall blaspheme those that are accounted

gods by other cities; nor shall any man be guilty of sacrilege in strange sanctuaries, or purloin what is consecrated to a god;’ and in his treatise against Apion, he has these words; ‘The Jews adhere to the customs of their fathers without concerning themselves with those of strangers, or deriding them. Their legislator expressly prohibited them from deriding or blaspheming those whom others accounted gods, and that out of respect to the title *Gods*, which they love.’ It may be admitted, perhaps, that there is nothing absolutely repugnant to our ideas of moral fitness in this sense of the passage, and yet there is very little reason to believe it the true sense; for the parallel clause, ‘nor curse the ruler of thy people,’ seems sufficiently to restrict and define the scope of the statute. But it is to be recollected that when Philo and Josephus wrote, the Jews were subjected to the Romans, a heathen people, and they would be apt, wherever it were possible, to put such a construction upon the precepts of their religion as would tend to procure for it the favorable regard of their masters, and prevent their deeming it intolerant. And there is no doubt something unreasonable and offensive in the thought of pouring contempt upon, or uttering blasphemy against, the gods and the religion, however false, of those under whose protection we live. But the laws given by Moses did not contemplate the chosen people in such a condition. They were not given to a nation subjected to foreign dominion, but to a free people, independent and isolated, among whom every approach to idolatry was strictly prohibited, and who were not required to *know* any but the true religion. And although we find no gratuitous disparaging or reviling of the gods of the heathen, yet when needs be we find Moses himself speaking contemptuously of them as *abominations* and *idols*, and in the prophets such language is of much more frequent occurrence. The

law in this place undoubtedly explains itself by the clause that follows, and a moment’s reflection will convince us that the institution of magistracy cannot attain the ends for which it was designed, unless the persons of rulers be clothed with a degree of sanctity that shall shield them from popular reproach. One reason undoubtedly why the name of ‘God’ was applied to magistrates was, that the office might be *sanctified* in general estimation, and that the conscience of him who held the office might be duly influenced by the consideration, that he was in a sense acting as God’s vicegerent and representing his person, authority, and attributes among men. Accordingly we find the apostle Paul distinctly recognising the obligation of this law even in respect to one who was in fact a most unrighteous persecutor, Acts, 23. 2—5, ‘And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him, to smite him on the mouth. Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law? And they that stood by, said, Revilest thou God’s high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.’ It is observable that no penalty is annexed to the breach of this law, either because it was left to the discretion of the judges, or because it was one of those cases which distinguish this from all human codes, where God saw fit to express so much confidence in the moral sense implanted in the breasts of his creatures, as to appeal to that alone. He leaves the law in this and the ensuing verses in this chapter to their own binding force upon the consciences of those to whom they are addressed.—¶ *Nor curse.* Heb תֹּאֲרַר *taor*, which though usually rendered ‘curse’ is by Paul, Acts 23. 5, explained as equivalent to ‘speak evil of.’



29 ¶ Thou shalt not delay *to offer* • the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors: † the first-born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me.

30 § Likewise shalt thou do with thine oxen, *and* with thy sheep: † seven days it shall be with his dam; on the eighth day thou shalt give it me.

31 ¶ And ye shall be † holy men  
 e ch. 23. 16, 19. Prov. 3. 9. † ch. 13. 2, 12.  
 & 34. 19. § Deut. 15. 19. † Lev. 22. 27. † ch. 19. 6. Lev. 19. 2. Deut. 14. 21.

### Law respecting Firstlings.

29. *Thou shalt not delay to offer the first, &c.* Heb. מְלֵאֲתֶהָ *meliatheka*, thy fullness; i. e. fruits of full maturity, ripe enough to be gathered. Gr. ἀπαρχὰς ἀλωνος, *the first fruits of thy floor.*

—¶ *Of thy liquors.* Heb. דְּמִיעָךְ *dima-maka*, thy tear; i. e. the first fruits of wine and oil, which when pressed, distil and drop as *tears*. The due observance of this law would be a general acknowledgement of the bounty and goodness of God, who had given them the early and latter rains and crowned the toils of agriculture with an ample harvest. This expression of gratitude was not to be *delayed*, for delay in rendering to God the first fruits would argue a secret unwillingness to yield him any. —

¶ *The first-born of thy sons, &c.* See Note on Ex. 13. 2.

30. *Seven days it shall be with his dam.* This ordinance probably carries an allusion to the dedication of a human being to God by the rite of circumcision. As this was to take place on the eighth day, so no animal was to be presented before the eighth day from its birth. Indeed, before this the process of nutrition in a young animal can scarcely be considered as completely formed.

### Law respecting Things not to be eaten.

31. *Ye shall be holy men unto me, &c.* Heb. אֲנֹשֵׁי קֹדֶשׁ *anshë kodesh*,

unto me: † neither shall ye eat *any* flesh *that is* torn of beasts in the field; ye shall cast it to the dogs.

### CHAPTER XXIII.

THOU † shalt not raise a false report: † put not thine hand with the wicked to be an † unrighteous witness.

† Lev. 22. 8. Ezek. 4. 14. & 44. 31. † ver. 7. Lev. 19. 16. Ps. 15. 3. & 101. 5. Prov. 10. 18. See 2 Sam. 19. 27. with 16. 3. † ch. 20. 16. Deut. 19. 16, 17, 18. Ps. 35. 11. Prov. 19. 5, 9, 28. & 24. 28. See 1 Kings 21. 10, 13. Matt. 26. 59, 60, 61. Acts 6. 11, 13.

*men of holiness*; i. e. men separated and distinguished from others not only by inward principles, but by outward observances, among which this of abstinence from unclean meats is one. This was to be a mark of that honorable distinction which was to pertain to the chosen people, who were not to demean themselves to eat of the leavings of beasts of prey, especially as they would be apt to contain blood, which was forbidden, and might also have been torn to pieces by unclean or rabid animals. The words are perhaps to be considered moreover as carrying with them a latent intimation that the holiness of the people of God depends in great measure upon their obedience in small matters.

### CHAPTER XXIII.

#### Law respecting Slander.

1. *Thou shalt not raise a false report, &c.* Heb. לֹא תִשָּׂא שְׁמַע שׁוּא *lo tissa shema shav*, thou shalt not take up (or receive) a hearing of vanity (or falsity). The primary import of the original נָשָׂא *nasa*, is to raise or lift up, to elevate; but it occurs also in the sense of taking, receiving, assuming. Thus too the Gr. οὐ παραδέξῃ ἀκοήν ματαιάν, *thou shalt not receive a vain hearsay*. Chal. 'Thou shalt not receive a false rumor.' The idea conveyed by the original term rendered 'false,' has a close affinity with that expressed by the word

2 ¶ <sup>c</sup> Thou shalt not follow a mul-

<sup>c</sup> Gen. 7. 1. & 19. 4, 7. ch. 32. 1, 2. Josh. 24. 15. 1 Sam. 15. 9. 1 Kings 19. 10. Job 31. 34. Prov. 1. 10, 11, 15. & 4. 14. Matt. 27. 24, 26. Mark 15. 15. Luke 23. 23. Acts 24. 27. & 25. 9.

'vain,' as is shown in the Note on Ex. 20. 16. And the prohibition comes obviously under that of the ninth commandment. The Hebrew word for 'raise,' is of sufficient latitude, in its legitimate sense, to imply both the *origination* and the *propagation* of a false report. Targ. Jon. 'O my people, ye sons of Israel, receive not lying words from him who would calumniate his neighbor before thee.' The precept is no doubt of general application, equivalent to saying, Thou shalt have *nothing to do* with any false reports; yet it seems designed to have special reference to *judicial proceedings*, where a false report or accusation might do a man the greatest injury. He who invents a slander, and first *raises* a false or vain report, and he who *receives* and propagates it, are at all times very criminal; but the iniquity is most atrocious when the calumny is advanced and taken up in a court of justice. Yet when we remember how many there must have been acting in a judicial capacity amongst the Israelites, who had judges of tens as well as of fifties and hundreds; and when we consider also, how generally in our own and other Christian countries, men are occasionally called to sit as jurors, we shall perceive how wide is its just application, and feel that no precept is of more importance in regulating the private intercourse of individuals. 'The original לא תשא *lo tissa* has been translated, 'thou shalt not publish.' Were there no *publishers* of slander and calumny, there would be no *receivers*; and were there none to *receive* them there would be none to *raise* them; and were there no *raisers*, *receivers*, nor *propagators* of calumnies, lies, &c., society would

titude to *do* evil; <sup>d</sup> neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment:

<sup>d</sup> ver. 6, 7. Lev. 19. 15. Deut. 1. 17. Ps. 72. 2.

be in peace.' *A. Clarke.* Prov. 17. 4, 'A wicked doer giveth heed to false lips.'—¶ Put not thine hand with the wicked, &c. Gr. *οὐ συγκαταστήσῃ, thou shalt not consent.* It is an allusion to the act of joining hands as a sign of entering into a compact, or of cordially uniting in the same enterprise; of which the wise man, Proverbs, 11. 21, says, 'Though *hand join in hand*, the wicked shall not be unpunished.' The primary import of the precept probably is, 'Take care that thou conspire not with a wicked man in his cause by giving witness in his favor.' Vulg. 'Nec junges manum, ut pro impio dicas falsum testimonium,' *neither shalt thou join thine hand to say false testimony for a wicked person.* But like the foregoing it is of general application.

#### *Law requiring Impartiality in Judgment.*

2. Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil. Heb. רבים *rabbim*, many. From the same root comes 'Rabbi,' a great man, and some have thought the more genuine sense of the clause to be, 'Follow not the great, the mighty, the distinguished, to do evil,' in contradistinction from the 'poor' in the next verse. The original word occurs in this sense, Job, 35. 9, 'They cry out by reason of the mighty (רבים *rabbim*.)' We suppose, however, that the two senses of *multitude* and *magnitude* are both included in the term, and that we are taught by the passage that neither the number, rank, nor power of those who do evil should avail to make us follow their example. We are to dare to be *singular*, whatever it may cost, if it is only thus that we can preserve our integrity. It is the example of the mul-

3 ¶ Neither shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause.

titude, keeping each other in countenance, that does so much for the general upholding of transgression. Did the current of public example set in the contrary direction, the *solitary* sinner would be universally shunned and detested.—¶ *Neither shalt thou speak in a cause, &c.* Heb. 'Neither shalt thou answer in a controversy to decline after many to pervert, or wrest (judgment).' The scope of the words is undoubtedly to enjoin it upon the chosen people not to be unduly influenced or carried away by the voice of a majority in pleading or deciding a judicial cause. They must not by any means allow themselves to be swayed or overruled by regard to the *Rabbins*, the *many*, or the *mighty*, to go against their consciences in giving judgment. They must at all events decide according to their honest convictions, and render an upright and impartial verdict. Chal. 'Neither shalt thou refrain from teaching that which thou seest to be meet in judgment.' Judges and juries especially were to guard against showing respect to the persons of their fellow-judges, as well as to those of the parties. They were not to suppose, as men are prone to do, that they could lose their own individual responsibility by merging it in the unanimous opinion of a majority. Accordingly Lyra remarks that it was decreed by the ancient Hebrews, that when the judges were numerous those of least weight and authority were required to give their sentence first, lest if they followed those of greater weight and influence, they might be unduly biassed by their verdict. This would probably not be amiss with those who needed an adventitious guaranty to the actings of sound moral principle, of whom there are no doubt too many in the world.

3. *Neither shalt thou countenance a*  
4\*

4 ¶ • If thou meet thine enemy's

<sup>e</sup> Deut. 22. 1. Job 31. 29. Prov. 24. 17. & 25. 21. Matt. 5. 44. Rom. 12. 20. 1 Thess. 5. 15.

*poor man in his cause.* Heb. דָּל לֹא יִהְיֶה דָּל וְתִהְיֶה לְךָ תִּדְדָר *vedal lo tehdar, and the poor man thou shalt not honor.* The term דָּרֵךְ *hadar*, has the sense of *beautifying, adorning*, and seems to refer to the arts of oratory and the sophistry of the law, by which the badness of a cause is varnished over. The word דָּל *dal*, *attenuated, exhausted*, and here rendered *poor man*, is probably put in opposition to רַבִּימִים *rabbim* in the preceding verse. If so, the meaning is, 'thou shalt neither be influenced by the *great* to make an unrighteous decision, nor by the poverty or distress of the *poor* to give thy voice against the dictates of justice and truth.' And thus the ancient paraphrasts; Chal. 'Thou shalt not pity the poor man in his judgment.' Targ. Jon. 'And the poor who shall be brought into judgment thou shalt not compassionately respect, for there is to be no respect of persons in judgment.' Gr. καὶ πένητα οὐκ ἐλεήσεις ἐν κρίσει, *and the poor man thou shalt not compassionate in judgment* In Lev. 19. 15, the like prohibition is given in regard to the rich, 'Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor (תִּהְיֶה לְךָ תִּדְדָר *tehdar*) the person of the mighty.' In matters of right, right was always to be done, without regard to rank, character, or condition. In general there was no doubt more danger that the cause of justice would be biassed and injury connived at in favor of the rich than of the poor, yet there might be such a thing as, under the pretence of charity or compassion, making a man's poverty a shelter for his wrong-doing. This was by no means to be allowed. But on the other hand, the just rights of the poor against influences of an opposite character, are guarded by a special precept, v. 6.

*Law inculcating Humanity.*

4. *If thou meet thine enemy's* ex or

ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again.

5 If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help

f Deut. 22. 4.

*his ass going astray, &c.* 'How much more his soul,' says Trapp. This precept is given with fuller details Deut. 22. 1—3, 'Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt in any case bring them again unto thy brother. And if thy brother be not nigh unto thee, or if thou know him not, then thou shalt bring it unto thine own house, and it shall be with thee until thy brother seek after it, and thou shalt restore it to him again. In like manner shalt thou do with his ass; and so shalt thou do with his raiment; and with all lost things of thy brother's, which he hath lost, and thou hast found, shalt thou do likewise: thou mayest not hide thyself.' He who was in the former case termed an 'enemy' is here termed a brother,' thus teaching the Israelites that they were to regard all men, even their enemies, as brethren. This, we know, is in exact accordance with the teachings of the New Testament, and it shows very clearly that it was no more than the Pharisees' gloss, that 'they should love their friends and hate their enemies.'—¶ *Thou shalt surely bring it back.* Heb. *הָשִׁיב הַשֶּׁבֶט תְּשִׁיבֵנוּ hashib teshibenu*, returning thou shalt return it.

5. *If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee, &c.* Heb. *שֹׂנְאָא sonaaka*, thy hater; a different word from that standing for enemy, *אֵיבָב oyibka*, in the preceding verse. The word here employed signifies *one that hates*, without implying that he is hated in return; but the other implies a *mutual enmity*. It is an easier matter to do a favor to the former than to the latter, but the design of introducing both terms is to intimate that both classes of *haters* were in this

him, thou shalt surely help with him.

6 g Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor in his cause.

g ver. 2. Deut. 27. 19. Job 31. 13, 21. Eccles. 5. 8. Isai. 10. 1, 2. Jer. 5. 28. & 7. 6. Amos 5. 12. Mal. 3. 5.

respect to be treated alike; that they were to show kindness as well where there was a reciprocal hatred, as where it was merely cherished on one side. —¶ *And wouldest forbear to help him, &c.* The original of this clause is, peculiarly obscure, and has given rise to a vast variety of renderings by different commentators. The original *וְהִדְלָה מִשֶּׁבֶט לְךָ עֹזֵב תְּעֹזֵב עִמּוֹ ve-had-alta maazob lo azob taazob immo*, literally signifies—'*thou shalt cease from leaving to him, thou shalt surely leave with him.*' The idea we take to be, that the man who should see his enemy's ass (or other animal) in this condition was to cease,—i. e. by no means to allow himself,—to leave the prostrated beast to his owner alone, but he was generously to go to his assistance, and not to desist but *with* the owner, when he had succeeded in raising him up, or had left him as past relief. This is perhaps the simplest construction, and it is confirmed by the parrallel passage Deut. 22. 4, 'Thou shalt not see thy brother's ass or his ex fall down by the way, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt surely help him to lift them up again.' Gr. 'Thou shalt not pass by the the same, but shalt raise up the same together with him.' Chal. 'Leaving thou shalt leave that which is in thy heart against him, and help up with him.' The scope of the precept is not only to inculcate mercy towards the brute creation, but also to engender kindly feelings among brethren. For what would tend more directly to win the heart of an alienated neighbor than such an act of well-timed benevolence?

6. *Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor in his cause.* That is, of

7 <sup>h</sup> Keep thee far from a false matter; <sup>i</sup> and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for <sup>k</sup> I will not justify the wicked.

<sup>h</sup> ver. 1. Lev. 19. 11. Luke 3. 14. Eph. 4. 25. <sup>i</sup> Deut. 27. 25. Ps. 94. 21. Prov. 17. 16, 26. Jer. 7. 6. Matt. 27. 4. <sup>k</sup> ch. 34. 7. Rom. 1. 18.

thy poor neighbor (Deut. 27. 19), in whose cause thou shalt not pervert, but shalt strictly exercise, justice. Though there were cases in which there was danger lest compassion should unduly bias the course of equity in favor of a poor man, yet the instances would be far more numerous in which the magistrate would be tempted to neglect or pervert his cause, either to oblige a rich opponent, or to save trouble, or because he had not money to pay the requisite expenses. But the expression, '*thy poor*,' is supposed to be a counteractive to all such temptations: 'Remember they are *thy poor*, bone of thy bone, thy poor neighbors, thy poor brethren, and cast in providence as a special charge upon thy justice and charity.'

7. *Keep thee far from a false matter, &c.* This law seems intended as a kind of security for the due observance of the preceding. If they would guard against perversions of judgment, they must dread the thoughts of aiding or abetting a bad cause; they must have nothing to do with it; they must keep themselves at the greatest possible distance from it. And why? Because if they wilfully or incautiously hearkened to false testimony, or decided wrong in a case of life and death, they would be deemed the *murderers* of the innocent and the righteous. Indeed it may be said that God interprets as slaying the innocent and righteous that conduct which *tends* to such an issue. If then they would not *slay* with their own hands those who looked to them for justice, let them 'keep far from a false matter;' for it might terminate in such

8 ¶ And <sup>l</sup> thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous.

<sup>l</sup> Deut. 16. 19. 1 Sam. 8. 3. & 12. 3. 2 Chron. 19. 7. Ps. 26. 10. Prov. 15. 27. & 17. 8, 23. & 29. 4. Isai. 1. 23. & 5. 23. & 33. 15. Ezek. 22. 12. Amos 5. 12. Acts 24. 26.

an issue as they dreamt not of, and the righteous God will not leave such wickedness to go unpunished. 'I will not justify the wicked;' i. e. I will condemn him that unjustly condemns others. 'Cursed be he that perverteth the judgment of the stranger, fatherless, and widow. And all the people shall say, Amen.' Deut. 27. 19.

#### *Law respecting Bribery.*

8. *Thou shalt take no gift, &c.* The precepts we are now considering still have respect to the duties of those who are appointed guardians of justice. They are instructions to magistrates in the conduct of judicial cases. *They* were to keep themselves studiously free from every thing that would tend to warp or bias their judgment, or in any way mar the rectitude of their decisions. Gifts from a party to a judge are absolutely prohibited, even though not given on the condition of his pronouncing a favorable verdict. For as human nature is constituted, *gifts* tend exceedingly to blind the understanding and to pervert the decisions of those who take them, and who would otherwise be disposed to follow equity in their sentences. The conduct of Sir Matthew Hale, when viewed by the light of this statute, is preeminently praiseworthy. Upon one of his circuits as judge, he refused to try the cause of a gentleman who had sent him the customary present of venison, until he had paid for it. He would not run the risk of suffering his feelings as a man to influence his decisions as a judge. It is worthy of note in this connexion, that in Deut. 27. 25, we find the connexion between the taking of

9 ¶ Also <sup>m</sup> thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.

10 And <sup>n</sup> six years thou shalt sow

<sup>m</sup> ch. 22. 21. Deut. 10. 19. & 24. 14, 17. & 27. 19. Ps. 94. 6. Ezek. 22. 7. Mal. 3. 5.  
<sup>n</sup> Lev. 25. 3, 4.

gifts and the murder of the innocent very distinctly recognized: 'Cursed be he that taketh reward to slay an innocent person.' This is an expressive commentary upon the tendency and effects of yielding to solicitations that come in the form of tempting bribes. On the contrary, how rich and emphatic the promises to those who keep themselves aloof from these abominations, Is. 33. 15, 16, 'He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; he shall dwell on high; his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks: bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure.'—¶ *The wise.* Heb. פקחים *pikhim*, the open-eyed, the seeing. The case of Samuel's sons, 1 Sam. 8. 1—3, affords an humiliating illustration of the effect ascribed to the conduct which is here condemned: 'And it came to pass, when Samuel was old, he made his sons judges over Israel. And his sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment.' In view of all this the wise man says, Prov. 17. 23, 'A wicked man taketh a gift out of the bosom to pervert the ways of judgment.'—¶ *Perverteth the words of the righteous.* That is, the sentence of those who are ordinarily accounted righteous, and who but for the corrupting influence of bribes would be righteous.

9. *Thou shalt not oppress a stranger.* This verse is little more than a partic-

thy land, and shalt gather in the fruits thereof:

11 But the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie still; that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beasts of the field shall eat. In like manner thou shalt deal with thy vineyard, and with thy oliveyard.

ular application of the general precept, ch. 22. 21, introduced in this connexion in order to put the judges on their guard against the influence of prejudice in deciding causes in which foreigners were concerned. They were to be sure not to oppress them; for from their own experience of hardships and injustice in Egypt, they knew how strangers *felt* on such occasions.—¶ *Ye know the heart of a stranger.* Heb. נפש *nephesh*, the soul; the sentiments, the feelings. Knowing the griefs and afflictions of strangers, ye can the more easily put your souls into their soul's stead. Our trials and sorrows in this world go but little way towards accomplishing their true object if they do not train us to a deep sympathy with those who are called to drink of the same bitter cup.

#### *Law respecting the Sabbatical Year.*

10, 11. *Six years thou shalt sow thy land, &c.* We have here one of the most remarkable ordinances of the Jewish code. As every seventh day was to be a Sabbath, so every seventh year was to be a Sabbatical Year, and hence in the repetition of this law, Lev. 25. 4, it is called 'a Sabbath of Sabbatism to the land, a Sabbath to Jehovah.' During that year the corn-fields were neither sown nor reaped. The vines were unpruned, and there were no grapes gathered. Whatever grew spontaneously belonged alike to all, instead of being the property of any individual; and the poor, the bondman, the day-laborer, the stranger, the cattle that ranged the fields, and the very game, then left undisturbed, could assert an equal right to

it. In short, during this year, the whole of Palestine continued a perfect common (Lev. 25. 1—8), and in order to render this law the more sacred, it was not only termed 'the year of the Sabbath,' its sabbatism or resting being declared holy to the Lord, but even the vines, as if under a vow, were called 'Nazarites' to which a knife must not be applied. Comp. Lev. 25. 5, with Num. 6. 5.

As to the reasons of an ordinance so remarkable, although we may perhaps admit that some regard was had to the physical benefits accruing to the soil from a periodical respite from culture for one year in seven, yet we cannot doubt that they were mostly of a *moral* nature, adapted and designed to promote the general ends of the economy to which the enactment belonged. As the Sabbath of the seventh year had the same reference as that of the seventh day to the creation of the world, it went to cherish all those pious and adoring sentiments which were awakened by the stated recurrence of the weekly day of rest. This septennial sabbatism reminded the Israelites not only of what they in common with the whole world, owed to the great and glorious Creator of the universe, but of their more especial obligations to him as their covenant God, who had made them the peculiar object of his care; and who was pleased miraculously to overrule the laws of nature in their behalf. It is scarcely possible to conceive of any more effectual mode of teaching them the duty of a continual simple-hearted reliance upon a kind and bountiful providence, than by the command to let the whole land lie fallow for one entire year, and to trust for subsistence to the provisions of that power which made the earth, and which could easily make the produce of the sixth year sufficient for the wants of the seventh or even the eighth. Were they ever tempted to cherish the slightest doubt or mis-

giving on this score, it was at once confuted by the express assurance of augmented plenty when it became requisite. Lev. 25. 20, 21, 'And if ye shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? behold, we shall not sow nor gather in our increase: Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years.' This was a plain intimation that a miracle should attend the strict observation of the law in question. Had such an extraordinary increase immediately succeeded the fallow year, it might have been accounted for according to the course of nature. The land had had a respite, and would naturally bring forth with more vigor. But when after being exhausted by constant tillage for five years, it produced more instead of less on the sixth, what was this but the manifest proof of a direct intervention of Omnipotence, showing as with the light of the sun that a particular providence incessantly watched over them? And not only so; the ordinance taught them impressively upon what tenure they held their possessions. They would be forced to acknowledge God as the lord of the soil, and themselves as liege-subjects of the great Proprietor, upon whose bounty their well-being continually hung. Intimately connected with this was the lesson of humanity which they were hereby taught to the *poor*, the *enslaved*, the *stranger*, and the *cattle*. The appointment of the Sabbatical Year was a striking demonstration that all classes and conditions of men, and even the beasts of the field, were mercifully cared for by the Universal Father; and what violence must they do to every kindly sentiment, if they could evince a contrary spirit? Once in every seven years they might freely suspend all the labors of agriculture, and yet rest in perfect security of an ample supply for their wants; and what could more directly tend to work the conviction upon their

12 ° Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest : that thine ox and thine

• ch. 20. 8, 9. Deut. 5. 13. Luke 13. 14.

minds that heaven had appointed them a higher destiny than to be always drudging in earthly toils ; that nothing would be lost by the prescribed intermission ; and that if God could, as we may say, *afford* to be thus munificent to them, they were bound to act on the like noble, liberal, and generous principles to their fellow-creatures ?

Another ordinance connected with the Sabbatical Year deserves our attention. On this year, during the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel came to appear before God the Law was to be 'read in their hearing, that they might learn, and fear the Lord their God, and observe to do all the words of this law ; and that their children which had not known any thing, might hear and learn to fear the Lord their God.' Deut. 31. 10—13. Thus once in every seven years the congregated nation had an opportunity to be instructed in the contents of the Law given by Moses ; and to render this ceremony more impressive, it is traditionally held that in after times the king in person was the reader. The season was the most eligible that could have been chosen. During this year the minds of the people were less occupied with worldly concerns than usual. They had neither to sow nor to reap. They were therefore peculiarly accessible to all the good influences connected with such an observance, and were prepared to look upon it as a striking type of heaven where all earthly labors, cares, and interests shall cease for ever.

Such was the institution of the Sabbatical Year, and such its effects in creating a sense of dependence in God, charity to man, and humanity to brutes. It was admirably adapted to be a test of the faith and obedience of the chosen people, and yet we are unhappily

ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed.

obliged to record the fact, that *they did not stand the test*. Not only is there no express mention of the actual observance of the law in the historical books of the Old Testament, but in 2 Chron. 36. 21, that neglect of it is spoken of as one of the procuring causes of the seventy years captivity to which they were subjected, during which the land was to enjoy the number of Sabbaths of which it had been defrauded by the rebellion and unbelief of its inhabitants. In other words, the years of their captivity were to correspond with the number of the neglected Sabbatical years ; and as those were seventy, it would carry us back about 500 years to the close of Samuel's administration, when the observance began to go into disuse. Thus blindly and madly does depraved man war against his own interest in neglecting the salutary appointments of Heaven !

#### *Law respecting the Sabbath day.*

12. *Six days thou shalt do thy work, &c.* A repetition of the law of the fourth commandment concerning the weekly sabbath. The reason of its insertion in this connexion has divided the opinions of commentators. Some suppose it to be mainly with a view to its *civil ends*, viz. the rest and relaxation of servants and beasts, whereas in the fourth commandment, it is enjoined chiefly as a *branch of worship*, as a part of that *spiritual service* which is rendered directly to God. Others again, and we think with greater probability, suppose the design to be to guard against an erroneous inference, that might be drawn from the preceding ordinance. As the sabbatical year was a year of cessation from the ordinary labors of other years, so they might pos



13 And in all *things* that I have said unto you, *p*be circumspect:

*p* Deut. 4. 9. Josh. 22. 5. Ps. 39. 1. Eph. 5. 15. 1 Tim. 4. 16.

sibly take up the impression, that the ordinary observances of the Sabbath day were also to be suspended during that year; that it was, as it were, laid open in common with the other days of the week. But this would be a groundless and pernicious inference, and therefore the law of the Sabbath is expressly repeated, and the people reminded that the observance of that day was of perpetual and paramount obligation, and not in the slightest degree annulled by the occurrence of the Sabbatical Year. For though they might not during that year be engaged in the ordinary labors of agriculture, and the day might not be so emphatically a day of rest to them as usual, yet even during that time there were various minor occupations and cares which were to be regularly suspended as every seventh day returned.—¶ *May be refreshed.* Heb. *יִנָּפֶשׁ yinnaphesh*, may be re-spirited, or *new-souled*, from *נֶפֶשׁ nephesh*, soul; i. e. may have a complete renewal both of bodily and spiritual health. Gr. *αναψυξη*, the same expression with that occurring Acts 3. 19, 'Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of *refreshing* (*αναψυξεως*, *re-souling*) shall come from the presence of the Lord.' The very frequent repetition of the law respecting the sabbath shows conclusively that the sanctification of that day was of great consequence in the sight of God, and that he had a special eye therein to its benign bearing physically both upon the welfare of man and beast. With this institution before us, we can no more ask the question, 'Doth God care for oxen?' So far from disregarding their well being, we find repeated provisions in his law breathing

and *q* make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth.

*q* Numb. 32. 38. Deut. 12. 3. Josh. 23. 7. Ps. 16. 4. Hos. 2. 17. Zech. 13. 2.

a most tender and beneficent concern for the brute creation subjected to the uses of man. How different from the light in which they are practically regarded by multitudes of civilized and nominally Christian men! How many thousands of patient drudging cattle and noble horses, have no sabbath! They cannot remonstrate when called from their quiet stalls on the sabbath, and put to their exhausting week-day toils, but the barbarous privation of their authorized rest speaks loudly in the ears of their merciful Creator, and their meek endurance reaches one heart in the universe that is not insensible to the appeal. That heart has a hand to execute judgment adequate to the wrong done to a portion of his creatures which have a capacity to suffer, but none to complain.

*Law enjoining caution against Idolatry.*

13. In all *things*—*be circumspect.* Heb. *תִּשְׁמָרֶם tish-shameru*, keep yourselves. It is a strict injunction of universal heedfulness in respect to every one of the divine precepts, but with more especial reference to those prohibiting idolatry in any of its forms; for to this sin Omniscience foresaw that they would be preeminently disposed and tempted.—¶ *Make no mention*, &c. Heb. *לֹא תִזְכְּרֶם lo tazkiru*, ye shall not cause to be remembered. They were to endeavor to blot out the remembrance of the gods of the heathen, and for this end their names were not to be heard from their mouths; or if mentioned at all, it must be only in a way of detestation. The Chal. terms these other gods 'idols of the peoples;' and God, by the prophet Zech. 13. 2, says, 'In that day I will cut off the

14 ¶ Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year.

15<sup>s</sup> Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread : (thou shalt eat

<sup>r</sup> ch. 34. 23. Lev. 23. 4. Deut. 16. 16. <sup>s</sup> ch. 12. 15. & 13. 6. & 34. 18. Lev. 23. 6. Deut. 16. 8.

unleavened bread seven days, as I commanded thee, in the time appointed of the month Abib; for in it thou camest out from Egypt: <sup>t</sup> and none shall appear before me empty :)

<sup>t</sup> ch. 34. 20. Deut. 16. 16.

names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered.' And again, Hos. 2. 17, 'I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name.' It was in accordance with the spirit of this precept that the Israelites seem to have made a practice of 'changing the names' of idolatrous places, Num. 32. 38. And under a similar prompting David says, Ps. 16. 4, 'Their drink-offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their names into my lips.' In the intercourse of society, there is no more emphatical mode of indicating hatred towards a person than not mentioning his name, shrinking from even the remotest allusion to him, and striving, as far as possible, to forget even his existence. Thus would God have his people do in regard to the gods of the heathen. He says to them in effect of idolatry, as elsewhere, 'Thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it; for it is a cursed thing.' The influence of a familiar acquaintance with the mythology of the ancient classics would no doubt be far more pernicious than it is, and more abhorrent to the spirit of this precept, were it not for the intrinsic absurdities of the system, and the overwhelming light of evidence which distinguishes Christianity. These are probably such as to counteract any serious injury which might otherwise result from one's being conversant with the names, characters, and alleged exploits of *Jupiter, Bacchus, Apollo, Mars, Venus*, and the other deities of Pantheon, of whom it seems to be essential to a liberal education to have some knowledge. The *practical*

evils on this score, we imagine, are at this day but slight.

#### *Law respecting the three great Festivals.*

14. *Three times thou shalt keep a feast, &c.* Heb. שלש רגלים *shalosh regalim*, three feet; i. e. three foot-journies. Gr. τρεις καιρους, *three times*. Chal. *id.* These three feasts were, (1.) The feast of the PASSOVER. (2.) Of PENTECOST. (3.) Of TABERNACLES; each of which continued for a week. As we shall hereafter have occasion to consider these festivals separately in all their details, it will be sufficient at present to remark in general that this thrice-yearly concourse of all the males of Israel at the place of the sanctuary, was well calculated, (1) To counteract all the unsocial tendencies arising from their separation into distinct tribes, and to unite them among themselves as a nation of brethren. Were it not for some provision of this kind, local interest and jealousies would have been very apt to be engendered, which in process of time would probably have ripened into actual hostilities and collisions that would have broken their commonwealth to pieces. But by being frequently brought together, the acquaintances of tribes and families would be renewed, all feelings of clannish exclusiveness repressed, and the social union more effectually consolidated. (2) It was an ordinance well calculated to perpetuate the memory of the great events on which they were severally founded. As the weekly sabbath brought to remembrance the creation of the world, so did the Passover the departure

from Egypt; the Pentecost, the delivery of the Law; and the Feast of Tabernacles, the sojourning in the wilderness. Whatever of salutary religious influence was exerted by the celebration of these memorable events, it would obviously bear with most weight when it became the joint act of the whole assembled nation. Moreover, as the Law was read and instruction imparted on these occasions, the effect would naturally be, to render them faithful to their religion, and better disposed to carry out its principles in their lives and conversation. (3) Another important end which we may suppose to have been designed by these assemblages, was to afford to the people seasons of relaxation and recreation from their necessary toils. Although the weekly sabbath brought with it a welcome respite from labor, yet the Maker of our frame saw that something more than this was requisite for the highest well-being, corporeal and mental, of his creatures, and therefore ordained certain seasons of innocent hilarity in connexion with those religious observances which would tend to keep them within proper limits. It is observable, therefore, that the expression, 'rejoicing before the Lord,' is of frequent occurrence in speaking of those festive conventions which brought the Hebrews together from time to time during the year; and it is no doubt desirable that the precepts of Christianity should be so construed as to lay no chilling interdict upon those harmless amusements which the constitution of our nature seems to render occasionally requisite.

It might seem at first view that there was signal impolicy in leaving the land defenceless, while all the adult male population were congregated at a distance from their families and homes. Humanly speaking, it is indeed surprising that the hostile nations on their borders did not take advantage of their exposedness. For the matter was no

secret; it was publicly known that at three set times every year they were commanded to be at Jerusalem, and that at three set times every year they actually attended. Why then were not inroads made at these seasons, to slay the old men, women, and children, to burn their cities, and carry off the spoil? How shall we account for the enmity of their foes being asleep at these particular times, when the land was defenceless; and perfectly awake at every other season, when they were at home, and ready to oppose them? Unless the Scriptures had given a solution, the matter would have been deemed inexplicable; but from this source we learn that the same Being who appointed those feasts guaranteed the security of the land while they were attending them. For thus runs the promise in Exodus 34. 23, 24, 'Thrice in the year shall all your men-children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel. For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God, thrice in the year.' Can any thing afford us a more striking instance of a particular providence? He is a wall of fire about his people as well as the glory in the midst of them. The hearts of all men are in his hands. He maketh the wrath of man to praise him and the remainder of that wrath, which will not praise him, he restraineth. During the whole period between Moses and Christ, we never read of an enemy invading the land at the time of the three festivals; the first that occurs was thirty-three years after they had withdrawn from themselves the divine protection, by embruing their hands in the Savior's blood, when Cestius the Roman general slew fifty of the people of Lydda, while all the rest were gone up to the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 66.

Again it is asked, how such vast multitudes could find provisions and accom-

16 <sup>u</sup> And the feast of harvest, the first-fruits of thy labours, which thou hast sown in the field: and <sup>x</sup> the

<sup>u</sup> ch. 34. 22. Lev. 23. 10. <sup>x</sup> Deut. 16. 13.

modation in the town where they congregated. The best answer will be found by a reference to the existing practice of the Mohammedans who annually repair to Mecca. The account is derived from our countryman Pitt, who was there towards the end of the seventeenth century, but the statement in its general features is equally applicable at present. After describing Mecca as a mean and inconsiderable town, he observes that four caravans arrive there every year, with great numbers of people in each. The Mohammedans say that not fewer than 70,000 persons meet at Mecca on such occasions; and although he did not think the number, when he was there, so large as this, it was still very great. Now the question recurs, how this vast multitude could find food and accommodation at so small and poor a place as Mecca? The following, from our author, is a sufficient answer:—‘As for house-room, the inhabitants do straiten themselves very much, in order at this time to make their market. As for such as come last after the town is filled, they pitch their tents without the town, and there abide until they remove towards home. As for provision, they all bring sufficient with them, except it be of flesh, which they may have at Mecca; but all other provisions, as butter, honey, oil, olives, rice, biscuit, &c., they bring with them as much as will last through the wilderness, forward and backward, as well as the time they stay at Mecca; and so for their camels they bring store of provender, &c. with them.’ Ali Bey confirms this account. He says, indeed, that the pilgrims often bring to Mecca rather more food than they are likely to need, and when there, they compute how much

feast of ingathering, *which* is in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of the field.

they shall want during their stay and on their return, and, reserving that, sell the remainder to great advantage. He adds, ‘Every *hadji* (pilgrim) carries his provisions, water, bedding, &c. with him, and usually three or four diet together, and sometimes discharge a poor man’s expenses the whole journey for his attendance upon them.’ These facts no doubt apply, in a great extent, to the solution of the apparent difficulty as to the management of the Hebrews in their three annual meetings at the Tabernacle or the Temple. It will also be recollected that Jerusalem was a much larger city than Mecca, and situated in an incomparably more fertile district.

We have only farther to add, that the three great Festivals were honored with three remarkable events in the Scripture history. The feast of Tabernacles was the time when the Savior was born, and also the time when, in his thirtieth year, he was baptized. The Passover was the time when he was crucified; and the Pentecost the time when the Holy Ghost descended in a visible manner upon the apostles.

16. *The feast of harvest.* When they offered two loaves of first-fruits, Lev. 23, 17, called in Ex. 34. 22, ‘the feast of weeks (or sevens)’, because it was seven weeks or forty-nine days from the feast of unleavened bread, and occurring on the fiftieth day, was thence called the Pentecost, a Greek word signifying *fifty*. This was properly the *harvest* festival, in which they were to offer thanksgiving to God for the bounties of the harvest, and to present unto him the first fruits thereof in bread baked of the new corn (wheat), Lev. 23. 14—21. Num. 28. 26—31. As the period of this festival coincided with

17  $\gamma$  Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the LORD God.

$\gamma$  ch. 34. 23. Deut. 16. 16.

that of the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai, which was fifty days after the Passover, it is usually spoken of as commemorative of that event, just as the feast of the Tabernacles is of their dwelling in tents for forty years during their sojourn in the wilderness.—

$\pi$  *The feast of ingathering.* Called also the 'Feast of Tabernacles,' Lev. 23. 34. Deut. 16. 13. This was the festival of gratitude for the *fruitage and vintage*, commencing on the evening of the fourteenth day of the seventh month, or October, called here 'the end of the year.' It continued seven whole days until the twenty-first, and then received the addition of the eighth day, which had probably in ancient times been the *wine-press feast* of the Israelites. During these eight days the Israelites dwelt in booths, formed of green branches interwoven together, which in the warm region of Palestine answered extremely well, as in October the weather is usually dry.—It may be remarked in regard to all these festivals, that the original term by which the appointment is expressed is *תָּהַגַּג* *tahag*, from *הָגַג* *hagag*, which signifies *to go round in a circle*, and thence in its religious application *to move round in circular dances*. As this was no doubt in early ages one of the leading features of their religious festivals, the term came in process of time to signify in a general way the *celebration of a religious feast or solemnity*. See Note on Ex. 5. 1. The idea, however, is prominent that these were to be seasons of joy and rejoicing; that a sanctified hilarity was to be regarded as a part of the duty connected with these festive seasons. The fact affords us an abundant vindication of the Mosaic system from the charge of sullen gloom and

18  $z$  Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened

$z$  ch. 12. 8. & 34. 25. Lev. 2. 11. Deut. 16. 4.

cheerless austerity in its rites and services.

17. *Shall appear before the Lord God.* Heb. *אֵל פְּנֵי הָאֲדֹנָי יְהוָה* *el penë ha-Adon Yehovah*, *to the face of the Lord Jehovah*. This is, before the symbol of the manifested presence of Jehovah, which permanently abode on the ark and in the temple. We are still to give prominence to the idea of a *visible* exhibition which the Israelites were to regard as representing the presence of the Deity. The expression, we have no doubt, has special allusion to the ark of the covenant surmounted by the luminous cloud of glory; and though the common Israelites were not indeed permitted to go into the Holy of Holies, yet they were to offer and to worship *towards* (*אֵל* *el*) the sanctuary where the sacred symbols were fixed. Chal. 'All thy males shall appear before the Lord, the master or ruler of the world.' Sam. 'Before the ark of the Lord.' Arab. 'In the sanctuary of the Lord God.' This version is somewhat remarkable when viewed in connexion with Josh. 3. 11, where, as appears from our Note on that passage, the epithet, 'Lord of the whole earth,' is expressly applied to the Ark of the Covenant.

*Law regulating the Offerings at the three great Feasts.*

18. *Thou shalt not offer the blood, &c.* That is, the blood of the paschal lamb, called by way of emphasis the 'sacrifice.' Chal. 'Of my passover.'— $\pi$  *With leavened bread.* That is, having leavened bread upon thy premises or in thy possession. All leaven was to be previously purged out, according to the statute, Ex. 12. 15, et inf.— $\pi$  *Neither shall the fat of any sacrifice remain, &c.* Heb. *הַגִּי* *haggi*, *my festi-*

bread: neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning.

19 <sup>a</sup> The first of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring into the house of the LORD thy God. <sup>b</sup> Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk.

20 ¶ <sup>c</sup> Behold, I send an Angel be-

<sup>a</sup> ch. 22. 29. & 34. 26. Lev. 23. 10, 17. Numb. 18. 12, 13. Deut. 26. 10. Neh. 10. 35. <sup>b</sup> ch. 34. 26. Deut. 14. 21. <sup>c</sup> ch. 14. 19. & 32. 34. & 33. 2, 14. Numb. 20. 16. Josh. 5. 13. & 6. 2. Ps. 91. 11. Isai. 63. 9.

val; a different word from that rendered *sacrifice* (זֶבַח *zebah*) in the preceding clause. Yet there is no doubt that it refers to the sacrifice of the passover as the parallel passage Ex. 34. 26, has expressly, 'Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven, neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left until the morning.' The fat was forbidden to remain till morning, because it was liable to corrupt and become offensive, which was very unseemly for any part of the sacred offerings. See Note on Ex. 12. 10. The fat was in all animal offerings accounted the choicest and most important part, and that which was preeminently devoted to God; and therefore it was required that it should be immediately consumed without any reservation. This was especially true of the fat of the paschal lamb.

19. *Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk.* The original word for *seethe* signifies *to cook or dress by the fire, whether by boiling, roasting, or baking.* The true import of the precept is somewhat doubtful. Most commentators take it as prohibiting some kind of superstitious custom practised by the neighboring heathen, a species of magical incantation, by which they thought to secure a plentiful harvest. But perhaps the most probable interpretation of this statute is, that it forbids the killing and cooking of a kid or lamb while it was on its mother's milk; i. e. during the period necessary for its own

fore thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared.

21 Beware of him, and obey his voice, <sup>d</sup> provoke him not; for he will <sup>e</sup> not pardon your transgressions: for <sup>f</sup> my name is in him.

<sup>d</sup> Numb. 14. 11. Ps. 78. 40, 56. Eph. 4. 30. Hebr. 3. 10, 16. <sup>e</sup> ch. 32. 34. Numb. 14. 35. Deut. 18. 19. Josh. 24. 19. Jer. 5. 7. Hebr. 3. 11. 1 John 5. 16. <sup>f</sup> Isai. 9. 6. Jer. 23. 6. John 10. 30, 38.

nutrition and the ease of its dam; as it is well known that all females for some time after parturition are generally oppressed with their milk. The mode of cooking alluded to in this passage, is not, it appears, wholly unknown among the Orientals at the present day. 'We alighted at the tent of the sheikh, or chief, by whom we were well received, and invited to take shelter with him for the night. Immediately after our halting a meal was prepared for us; the principal dish of which was a young kid seethed in milk.' *Buckingham.*

#### *Promise of a Tutelary Angel.*

20, 21. *Behold, I send an Angel before thee, &c.* Heb. הנה אנכי שלח מלאך לפניך *hinneh anoki sholah malak lepanēka, behold me sending an angel before thee; i. e. about to send.* See Note on Gen. 6. 13, 17. The reader is referred to the note on 'the Pillar of Cloud,' p. 164, for an expansion of our views on the import of the word 'Angel' in this connexion. We have there, if we mistake not, adduced satisfactory reasons for believing that the Angel here mentioned was the Shekinah, which was identical with the Pillar of Cloud, that guided the march of the children of Israel through the desert. According to this view, the *sensible phenomenon*, and not any unseen agent, whether divine or angelic, is what is primarily to be understood by the 'Angel.' This sublime and awful object they were re-

22 But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then <sup>g</sup>I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries.

<sup>g</sup> Gen. 12. 3. Deut. 30. 7. Jer. 30. 20.

quired to consider as the visible representative of Jehovah himself and to demean themselves towards it as obediently and reverentially as if it had been a living, intelligent, personal witness both of their outward actions and their inward thoughts, which we may not improperly say that it was, inasmuch as the Most High was pleased to associate his attributes of omniscience and omnipotence with it. All the language employed is such as to warrant this view of the subject. They were to beware of it, to obey its voice, to provoke it not, and that under the fearful sanction that an opposite conduct could not be evinced with impunity; that it would be sure to meet with condign punishment. Of this the grand assurance was contained in the declaration, 'My name is in him,' or rather according to the original (בְּקִרְבוֹ *bekirbo*), *my name is in the midst of him, or it*. It is well known to the Hebrew scholar that the proper expression for *being in a person* is בְּ *bo*, *in him*; but here we find a phraseology strictly appropriate to *being within*, or in the *central parts of any gross, inanimate mass of matter*. We cannot but understand it therefore as carrying the implication that the name; i. e. the attributes—the intelligence, the power, the majesty, the glory of the Godhead—were to be considered as being mysteriously united with and abiding in the overshadowing and guiding Cloud. Arab. 'My name is with him.' Chal. 'His word is in my name;' i. e. he is clothed with my authority. Syr. and Gr. 'My name is upon him.' As we have before endeavored to show that the remarkable symbol of the

23 <sup>h</sup>For mine Angel shall go before thee, and <sup>i</sup>bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off.

<sup>h</sup> ver. 20. ch. 33. 2. <sup>i</sup> Josh. 24. 8, 11.

Cloudy Pillar was a preintimation of Christ's appearing in flesh, we see how naturally the apostle's words, 1 Cor. 10. 9, harmonize with this interpretation; 'Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.' By tempting the Angel that served to them as the *anticipative shadow* of Christ, they may be said to have tempted Christ himself, as nothing is more usual in the Scriptures than to apply to the *type* or *figure* the language which belongs to the *substance*. It is as proper to recognize Christ in the Angel of the Covenant before his incarnation, as it is to recognize him in 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.'

22. *But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, &c.—then I will be, &c.* Here the divine speaker seems imperceptibly to glide into the person of the promised Angel of whom he speaks. In the next verse the person is again changed, and he speaks as before. It is to be borne in mind that Moses was at this time on the summit of the mount, holding communion with God in the Shekinah; but we perceive nothing in this fact that militates with the view advanced above. The very *appearance* that rested upon Mount Sinai and now conversed with Moses, might be modified into the Pillar of Cloud and in that form denominated the emissary Angel that was to conduct the people on their journey to Canaan.

23. *For mine Angel shall go before thee—and I will cut them off.* Here again is another interchange of persons, similar to that above mentioned, and such as cannot fail to be frequently noticed by the attentive reader of the Scriptures.

24 Thou shalt not <sup>k</sup> bow down to their gods, nor serve them, <sup>l</sup> nor do after their works : <sup>m</sup> but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images.

<sup>k</sup> ch. 20. 5. <sup>l</sup> Lev. 18. 3. Deut. 12. 30, 31. <sup>m</sup> ch. 34. 13. Numb. 33. 52. Deut. 7. 5, 25. & 12. 3.

It does not appear that the Jehovah of the Jews was a *different* being from him who is here and elsewhere termed 'the Angel.' Indeed the original phrase, מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה *malak Jehovah*, may quite as properly be rendered 'Angel Jehovah,' as 'Angel of Jehovah,' or 'Angel of the Lord,' which is equivalent.

*Idolatry to be avoided and abolished.*

24. *Thou shalt not bow down to their gods.* Heb. לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה *lo tishtahaveh*, properly signifying 'bow down,' though for the most part rendered 'worship,' and used to express, in a general way, all the various external acts and services of religious adoration. See Note on Gen. 18. 2—¶ *Nor serve them.* Heb. תַּעֲבֹדֵם *ta'ebdēm*. That is, shall not pray to them, praise them, nor so conduct towards them as to declare thyself bound, devoted, or dedicated to them. Gr. μη λατρεύσεις αυτοις, *shalt not perform service to them*. But in v. 33, the same term תַּעֲבֹד *taabod* is rendered in the Greek by δουλευσῃς, from which it would appear that the Septuagint versionists used the terms δουλεω and λατρευω, in reference to religious worship, synonymously.—¶ *Nor do after their works.* It would seem from the construction, that the most natural antecedent to 'their' is 'gods,' in which case the meaning is, that the Israelites were not to do after the works *which the service of the heathen gods required*, which naturally flowed out of their worship, and were incorporated with it. But Ainsworth understands 'their' as having reference to the *idolatrous worshippers*, and this may be admitted

25 And ye shall <sup>n</sup> serve the LORD your God, and <sup>o</sup> he shall bless thy bread, and thy water ; and <sup>p</sup> I will take sickness away from the midst of thee.

<sup>n</sup> Deut. 6. 13. & 10. 12, 20. & 11. 13, 14. & 13. 4. Josh. 22. 5. & 24. 14, 15, 21, 24. 1 Sam. 7. 3. & 12. 20, 24. Matt. 4. 10. <sup>o</sup> Deut. 7. 13. & 28. 5. 8. <sup>p</sup> ch. 15. 26. Deut. 7. 15.

without doing any violence to the text, though we think the other sense most correct.—¶ *Thou shalt utterly overthrow them.* Here the pronoun 'them' refers to the gods, and not to the people their worshippers ; which confirms the construction given above. The *subject* seems to be the same throughout the verse, viz. the idol deities of the Canaanites. The idol worshippers were indeed to be destroyed, but that is not the immediate topic treated of in this verse. The divine Speaker is here commanding the total excision of all the memorials of that vile idolatry, which would be likely to seduce his people from their allegiance to him. It was enjoining upon them the same spirit with that which afterwards prompted the convicted conjurors to 'burn their books,' Acts, 19. 19.

*Farther Precepts and Promises.*

25. *And ye shall serve the Lord your God.* Nothing can be more reasonable than the conditions which Jehovah imposes upon his people—that they should serve their own God, who was indeed the only true God, and have nothing to do with the gods of the devoted nations, which were no gods, and which they had no reason to respect. In doing this they would not only be acting the part of sound reason, but would assure themselves also of the special tokens of the divine blessing. They would be secure of the enjoyment of all desirable temporal prosperity. The blessing of God would crown their bread and their water, and make that simple fare more refreshing and nutritive than the richest



26 ¶ q There shall nothing cast their young, nor be barren, in thy land: the number of thy days I will r fulfil.

27 I will send s my fear before

q Deut. 7. 14. & 28. 4. Job 21. 10. Mal. 3. 10, 11. r Gen. 25. 8. & 35. 29. 1 Chron. 23. 1. Job 5. 26. & 42. 17. Ps. 55. 23. & 90. 10. s Gen. 35. 5. ch. 15. 14, 16. Deut. 2. 25. & 11. 25. Josh. 2. 9, 11. 1 Sam. 14. 15. 2 Chron. 14. 14.

dainties without it, while wasting sickness, with its fearful train of evils, should be effectually banished from their borders.

26. *The number of thy days, &c.* That is, thou shalt not be prematurely cut off before reaching that good old age, which in the ordinary course of things thou mayest expect to attain. This is the blessing of the righteous, as is said of Job, ch. 42. 17, 'So Job died, being old, and full of days,' whereas 'the wicked live not half their days,' Ps. 55. 23.

27. *I will send my fear before thee.* Will strike a panic terror into the inhabitants of Canaan before thine arrival, which shall facilitate the subsequent conquests. The words of the historian Josh. 2. 9, 11, show how precisely this threatening was fulfilled. —¶ *Will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come.* Heb. הַמֹּתִי *hammothi*. But if they were previously destroyed, how could the Israelites come to them? It is evident that our translation has followed the Vulg. which has 'occidam,' *I will slay*, as if the original were the Hiph. conjug. of מָוֹת *muth*, to die—to cause to die, to kill. But the pointing on this supposition is not normal, and there is little reason to doubt that the root of the verb is not מָוֹת to die, but הִמָּוֶה to terrify, *confound, discomfit*, correctly rendered by the Gr. ετασθησω, *I will strike with dismay*. So also the Arab. 'I will make them astonished.' Chal. 'I will put in disorder.' In Cranmer's Bible it is

thee, and will t destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come, and I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee.

28 And u I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee.

t Deut. 7. 23. u Deut. 7. 20. Josh. 24. 12.

rendered 'I will trouble,' a much better version than the present, for the context shows that the word cannot here mean to *destroy*, but to *trouble, intimidate, dismay*, so as to make them *turn their backs* to the Israelites. It is intensive of the former clause, denoting the consternation into which they should be thrown, and their consequently becoming an easy prey to their enemies.—¶ *Make all thine enemies turn their backs to thee.* Heb. עָרַף oreph, neck. In like manner Ps. 18. 40, 'Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me.'

28. *I will send hornets before thee.* Heb. אֶת הַצְּרִיחַ *eth hatz-tzirah*, the hornet; collect. sing. like 'locusts,' Ex. 10. 4, for 'the locust.' The same thing is equally explicitly said, Deut. 7. 20, 'Moreover, the Lord thy God will send the hornet among them, &c.' As we are not expressly informed elsewhere that this annunciation was literally fulfilled, several interpreters have inferred that it is a mere metaphorical expression for enemies armed with weapons, as hornets are with stings. Bochart, however, and others, maintain that the prediction was literally accomplished, and this interpretation is said to be confirmed by the words of Joshua, ch. 24. 12, 'And I sent the hornet before you, even the two kings of the Amorites; but not with thy sword nor with thy bow,' and this we consider on the whole as the most correct opinion. Some commentators, however, explain it of

29 **W**I will not drive them out from before thee in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee.

30 By little and little I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and inherit the land.

<sup>w</sup> Deut. 7. 22.

the anxieties, perplexities, and pungent stinging terrors which should seize the minds of the devoted Canaanites upon the approach of Israel. After all, the reader must be thrown upon the resources of his own judgment as to its import in this place. See the subject more fully canvassed in the Note on Josh. 24. 12.

29. *I will not drive them out from before thee in one year.* Nor in fact in four hundred years was this expulsion entirely effected. It was only in the times of David and Solomon that their enemies could be fairly said to have been driven out. The reason of this delay is stated to be, lest the land, being in a great measure left destitute of its former occupants, should be infested by great numbers of wild beasts. But it is a natural inquiry, what grounds there were to apprehend that the expulsion of the former inhabitants would leave any part of Canaan vacant, when there were at least two millions of Israelites to fill their place?—a number sufficient, it would seem, to occupy every nook and corner of the land. To this it may be answered, that the words do not respect merely the country of Canaan proper, lying between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, but the larger region embraced in the promise to Abraham, Gen. 15. 18, and the boundaries of which Moses immediately goes on to give. This was an immense territory, and it is obvious that its sudden depopulation would be attended by the consequences here stated. It was, therefore, wisely ordered that the extirpa-

31 And **X**I will set thy bounds from the Red sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river: for I will **Y** deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand: and thou shalt drive them out before thee.

<sup>x</sup> Gen. 15. 18. Numb. 34. 3. Deut. 11. 24. Josh. 1. 4. 1 Kings 4. 21, 24. Ps. 72. 8. <sup>y</sup> Josh. 21. 44. Judg. 1. 4. & 11. 21.

tion of the Canaanites should be *gradual*, especially when we consider that the continued presence of enemies would keep them on their guard, and prevent them from settling down into that sluggish supineness to which they would otherwise be prone. Thus too in our spiritual warfare, it is no doubt ordained for our highest good that our corruptions should be subdued, not all at once, but by little and little; that our old man should be crucified gradually. We are hereby necessarily kept in an attitude of perpetual vigilance, and reminded of our constant dependence upon God, who alone giveth us the victory.

31. *I will set thy bounds, &c.* On these boundaries of the promised land see Note on Josh. 1. 4. This land, in its utmost extent, they were not to possess till the days of David. Not that there was any positive prohibition against it, or any intrinsic necessity that their occupancy should be so long deferred; but God saw that their own culpable remissness would preclude the speedier accomplishment of the promise, and according to Scripture language he is often said to order or appoint what he does not prevent.—¶ *Sea of the Philistines.* The Mediterranean, on the coast of which the Philistines dwelt.—¶ *From the desert unto the river.* From the desert of Arabia to the river Euphrates. See Note on Josh. 1. 4. Thus 1 Kings, 4. 21, 'And Solomon reigned over all kingdoms from the river to the land of the Philistines;' i. e. the river Euphrates.

32<sup>z</sup> Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods.

33 They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me: for if thou serve their gods, <sup>a</sup> it will surely be a snare unto thee.

<sup>z</sup> ch. 34. 12, 15. Deut. 7. 2. <sup>a</sup> ch. 31. 12. Deut. 7. 16. & 12. 30. Josh. 23. 13. Judg. 2. 3. 1 Sam. 18. 21. Ps. 106. 36.

32, 33. *Thou shalt make no covenant, &c.* The import of this precept evidently is, that they should contract no such alliances, nor cherish any such intimacies with the devoted nations, as would endanger the purity of their religious worship. If they would avoid the peril of being drawn into the fatal snare of becoming worshippers of false gods, they must keep themselves aloof from all familiarity with idolaters. They must not even suffer them to sojourn amongst them, so long as they adhered to their idolatrous practices. Evil communications corrupt good manners, and by familiar converse with the votaries of idols, their dread and detestation of the sin would imperceptibly wear off, and they would find themselves, before they were aware, transferring their worship and allegiance from the true God to the vanities of the heathen. The language implies that the serving of false gods is nothing else than *making a covenant* with them, and that this is a very natural consequence of making a covenant with those who worship them.

#### CHAPTER XXIV.

In the present chapter a transition is made from the recital of the several judicial laws embodied in the two chapters preceding, to the narrative which relates the ratification of the national covenant, the building of the Tabernacle, and the institution of the various rites and ceremonies to be observed in the permanent worship of Jehovah. The leading incidents here recorded are the solemn adoption and ratification of

#### CHAPTER XXIV.

AND he said unto Moses, Come up unto the LORD, thou, and Aaron, <sup>a</sup> Nadab, and Abihu, <sup>b</sup> and seventy of the elders of Israel; and worship ye afar off.

<sup>a</sup> ch. 28. 1. Lev. 10. 1, 2. <sup>b</sup> ch. 1. 5. Numb. 11. 16.

the foregoing law on the part of the people, the ascent of Moses and the elders to or towards the summit of the mount, and the august vision there vouchsafed them of the Divine Glory, or the Shekinah, another term for 'the God of Israel,' appearing by his appropriate symbol. The true nature and objects of this remarkable manifestation will appear more evident as we proceed in our annotations, from which the reader will probably infer, and with great justice, that the whole scene was one of far richer significance than is usually imagined.

1. *And he said unto Moses, Come up unto the Lord.* That is, God said. It would probably have been written 'the Lord said unto Moses,' were it not to prevent a repetition of the word 'Lord' in the same clause. We are still to bear in mind the remark so often made before that the 'Lord' (Jehovah) to whom they were to come up was the *visible Jehovah* now abiding in the summit of Sinai. Accordingly the Chal. has, 'Come up before the Lord;' and the Arab. 'Come up to the Angel of God.' It would seem to be unquestionable from a comparison of the context with Ex. 19, 24—20. 21, that these words were spoken to Moses while yet on the mount and before he had retired from the thick darkness into which he had entered. Consequently as he could not be commanded to ascend the mountain when he had already ascended it, and was abiding on its top, we are forced to understand the words as implying that he was to come up after having previously gone down and pro-

2 And Moses <sup>c</sup> alone shall come near the LORD: but they shall not come nigh; neither shall the people go up with him.

3 ¶ And Moses came and told the

<sup>c</sup> ver. 13. 15, 18.

pounded to the people the foregoing code, obtained their assent, and performed the various covenant transactions mentioned, v. 3—9. When this was done, he and his specified company were to ascend the mountain to receive the further instructions and revelations which God designed to impart.—

¶ *Nadab and Abihu.* These were the two sons of Aaron who came to such a fearful end for their presumptuous transgression in offering strange fire before the Lord, Lev. 10. 1, 2. When we behold *their* names in the list of the honored company selected for this near approach to God, and then cast our thoughts forward to the awful doom which they not long after brought upon themselves, we are led to the most serious reflection. How clearly does the incident show that God's outward gifts and callings are often different from his 'election according to grace!' And how forcibly is the lesson inculcated upon us, that no mere external privileges, prerogatives, professions, forms, or favors will avail us ought to the saving of our souls without an inward renewal to holiness wrought by the life-giving spirit of God!—¶ *Seventy of the elders of Israel.* That is, seventy of the aged men of the congregation; men distinguished, respected, and venerated among the different tribes. The *official* elders mentioned Num. 11. 16, were not yet appointed. This company was selected in order that they might be witnesses of the glorious appearance about to be made, and of the communion with God to which Moses was admitted, that their testimony might confirm the people's faith in their leader and teacher.

—¶ *Worship ye afar off.* Gr. *προσ-*

people all the words of the LORD, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, <sup>d</sup> All the words which the LORD hath said will we do.

<sup>d</sup> ver. 7. ch. 19. 8. Deut. 5. 27. Gal. 3. 19. 20.

*κυνησουσι μακρῶθεν τῷ Κυρίῳ, they shall worship the Lord at a distance;* from which it would appear that they understood this direction as having reference exclusively to those who accompanied Moses on this occasion. The letter of the text does not make this distinction, yet from the ensuing verse it appears not improbable. From that it appears, that, while the body of the people stood at the foot of the mountain, Aaron and his two sons, and the seventy elders, went up probably about half way, and Moses, being privileged with nearer access, went alone quite to the summit, and entered the bright and fiery cloud which rested upon it. Thus in a typical manner he sustained the person of Christ, who, as our great High Priest, entered alone into the most holy place. This arrangement, which presents to us the people at the base of the mountain, the priests and the elders half the way up its sides, and Moses on its summit, affords us a striking view of the several grades which God has appointed in his church. Only it is to be remembered that the office represented in Moses is now merged in that of Christ, and the two grand distinctions of *people* and *pastors* or *elders* are all that are known under the Gospel; the order of *deacons* being merely a kind of servants to the people, ordained to superintend the temporalities of the several congregations.

3. *And Moses came and told the people, &c.* In this and the eight following verses we have an account of the important transactions in which Moses was engaged in the interval between his descent from the mount and his subsequent ascent thither in obedience

4 And Moses <sup>e</sup> wrote all the words of the LORD, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar

<sup>e</sup> Deut. 31. 9.

under the hill, and twelve <sup>f</sup>pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel.

<sup>f</sup> Gen. 28. 18, & 31. 45.

to the divine injunction, v. 1, and in company with Aaron and his sons and the elders. His first business was to set before the people the body of laws, moral, civil, and ceremonial, which had been delivered from Mount Sinai, together with the promises of special blessings to be secured to them on condition of obedience. This was in fact proposing to them the terms of a *national covenant*, which was to be ratified with very solemn ceremonies, and enforced with solemn sanctions. To this covenant the people, it appears, were prompt to give their unanimous and cheerful consent, saying, 'All the words which the Lord hath said will we do.' They had before, ch. 19. 8, consented in general to come under God's government; here they consent in particular to those laws now given. The Most High might, indeed, in virtue of his sovereign authority, have enjoined his laws upon the nation without the formality of any stipulation on their part to obey them, but he condescended to give the whole affair the form of a covenant transaction, as something more calculated to win upon the generous sentiments of their hearts, and to draw forth a more affectionate obedience, than a code of precepts enjoined upon them by simple authority and appealing sternly to a bare sense of duty. God loves to endear his requisitions to the hearts of his creatures. But notwithstanding the readiness of the people thus to assume, without reservation or exception, the responsibilities of the covenant, it was no doubt done with a certain degree of precipitation and rashness, without being aware of their innate impotency to live up to the full extent of the obligations which they hereby incurred. On other occasions in the

history of the chosen race we find instances of the same sanguine promptitude in making vows and promises, followed, alas, but too speedily by the grossest acts of defection and rebellion; which led one of the ancient fathers to compare the Israelites to locusts, 'Subito saltus dantes, et protinus ad terram cadentes,' *suddenly giving an upward spring, and forthwith falling upon the earth again*. The figure is but too fair an illustration of the halting obedience of the best of God's children in this world.

4. *And Moses wrote, &c.* Although it must have occupied a considerable part of the day, and perhaps of the night also, yet in a transaction of this solemn nature it was evidently proper that the articles of the covenant about to be entered into should be reduced to writing, that there might be no mistake, and that it might be transmitted to posterity, who are equally to come under its obligations. The fact that God himself had previously written the words of the Decalogue on tables of stone does not necessarily militate with the supposition that Moses now made a record of them in writing, to be read in the audience of the people. These tables he had not yet received. It was only when he came down from the mount, after the golden calf was erected in the camp, that he brought with him these divinely written records.—  
 ¶ *Builded an altar under the hill and twelve pillars*; the altar as a representative of God, as the first and principal party to this covenant; and the twelve pillars as the representatives of the twelve tribes of the people as the other party. Between these two covenanting parties Moses acted as real and typical mediator. Gr. 'He built an altar under the mountain, και δωδεκα λιθους εις τας

5 And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the LORD.

6 And Moses <sup>g</sup> took half of the blood, and put *it* in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar.

7 And he <sup>h</sup> took the book of the

<sup>g</sup> Hebr. 9. 18. <sup>h</sup> Hebr. 9. 19.

*δωδεκα φυλας του Ισραηλ, and twelve stones for the twelve tribes of Israel;* as if each of the pillars consisted of a single stone, which we incline to believe was the fact; but it is not certain; they may have consisted of heaps of stones.

5. *And he sent young men, &c.* That is, the first-born, who officiated as priests and sacrificers till the Levites were appointed by substitution in their stead, Num. 3. 41. The term, as is remarked in the Note on Gen. 14. 24, does not imply persons of youthful age, but those who were qualified to act in this ministerial service, which would naturally require men of mature years. Chal. 'He sent the first-born of the sons of Israel.' The Targ. Jon. adds, 'For to this hour the business of worship was among the first-born, seeing that as yet the tabernacle of the covenant was not built, neither had the priesthood been given to Aaron.' It is observable that there was no solemn religious ceremony in any part of the Mosaic dispensation, in which there was not a sacrifice, no approach to God until he was thus propitiated. These of course were typical of that one great offering of the Son of God, afterwards to be presented, which has for ever abrogated all others. By this, peace was made between God and his sincere worshippers, who bring that sacrifice in faith, and lay it on his altar. But until the fulness of time was come, the bodies of oxen and sheep, of goats and calves, prefigured the body of Christ which he offered up, once for all, upon

covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, 'All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be obedient.'

8 And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled *it* on the people, and said, Behold <sup>k</sup> the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words.

<sup>i</sup> ver. 3. <sup>k</sup> Hebr. 9. 20. & 13. 20. <sup>l</sup> Pet. 1. 2.

the cross, expiating then the sins of men; and the people were thus taught the need of a sacrifice to propitiate as well as of a mediator to stand between them and God, and to intercede for them.—¶ *Of oxen.* From Heb. 9. 19, it appears that other animals were sacrificed on this occasion; 'He took the blood of calves and of goats,' &c. Oxen, or rather bullocks, are mentioned as being principal.

6—8. *And Moses took half of the blood, &c.* The application of the blood of the victim more explicitly demands our attention in considering the circumstances of this solemn rite. Being divided into two equal parts, one half was put into one basin, the other into another. The first was then taken, and the blood sprinkled upon the altar, the representative of God, thereby denoting that he, on his part, engaged to be faithful in the covenant relation which he now condescended to assume, performing all the promises and conferring all the blessings which their corresponding fidelity would entitle them to expect. As Moses here says the altar was sprinkled, but makes no mention of the book, and as Paul, Heb. 9. 19, speaks of the book's being sprinkled, but says nothing of the altar, the presumption is, that the book was laid upon the altar, and thus both the book and the altar partook of the sacred affusion. The import of the act was solemn and awful in the extreme, and the form of adjuration is supposed to

9 ¶ Then <sup>1</sup> went up Moses, and

<sup>1</sup> ver. 1.

Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel.

have been substantially the following; 'As the body of this victim is cloven asunder, as the blood of this animal is poured out, so let my body be divided and my blood shed, if I prove unfaithful and perfidious.' Under a stipulation of this fearful import, the people consent to the conditions of the compact, and again declare their purpose to abide steadfastly by the divine requirements. Upon this Moses took the other basin of blood, and sprinkled its contents 'on the people;' i. e. either on the twelve pillars which stood as the representatives of the people, or upon a portion of the elders of the congregation in the name of the whole body. As the sprinklings and purifyings under the law were usually performed with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, Lev. 14. 6, 7, such also, as we learn from the apostle, Heb. 9. 19, was the case in the present instance. The application of the blood was the seal of the covenant, giving to the whole transaction its crowning and binding sanction. It is, accordingly, with the most solemn emphasis that Moses adds, 'Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words;' i. e. the blood by the shedding of which the covenant is ratified and confirmed. In like manner our Savior, in instituting that ordinance which was to be a perpetual seal of the new covenant of grace, said to his disciples, 'This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' And it should not be forgotten, that all those who adjoin themselves to the Lord in this sacred ordinance have the guilt of blood resting upon them if they prove unfaithful, and that the Savior probably alludes to the understood penalty of this kind of covenant-breaking, when he says, Luke, 12. 43—46, 'Blessed is that servant,

whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, That he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the men-servants, and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and *will cut him in sunder*, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.' This 'cutting asunder' alludes to the virtual imprecation of every one who entered into covenant over the divided members of the victim slaughtered on such occasions. Compare with this Heb. 9. 19, 20.—¶ *Took the book of the covenant, and read, &c.* In order that the people might be completely aware of what they were about to undertake, though they had been told before, he took the book, and read from it all that he had there written. He read it that they might be sure that what was contained in it, and what they were going, as it were, to *sign*, was the same as he had previously spoken to them, and they had promised to observe. He read it that their memories might be refreshed, and their consent given with full knowledge and due deliberation.

9. *Then went up Moses and Aaron, &c.* The several preliminary ceremonies and services mentioned above having been completed, Moses and his chosen attendants now make their ascent up the mountain, in obedience to the command before given, v. 1. From v. 13, it appears evident that Joshua constituted one of the company, though his name is not here mentioned. The omission may perhaps have been owing to the fact that he went not in a representative character, but simply as a personal attendant or minister to Mo-

10 And they <sup>m</sup>saw the God of Israel: and *there was* under his feet

<sup>m</sup> See Gen. 32. 30. ch. 3. 6. Judg. 13. 22. Isai. 6. 1, 5. with ch. 33. 20, 23. John 1. 18. 1 Tim. 6. 16. 1 John 4. 12.

ses.—In the brief narrative contained in this and the two ensuing verses, we enter upon the consideration of one of the most remarkable events recorded in the whole compass of the sacred story. The sublime and glorious spectacle to which these favored sons of Israel were now admitted is, no doubt, the germ of many of the most magnificent descriptions of the symbolical scenery of the prophets, and especially of the *theophanies*, or *visible manifestations of the Deity*, which we find subsequently recorded, and capable, if expanded into all its details, of filling a volume.

10. *And they saw the God of Israel.* Heb. *וַיִּרְאוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* *vayiru eth Elohê Yisraël*, and they saw the God of Israel. As we are assured upon the authority of inspiration, 1 Tim. 6. 16, that 'no man hath seen or can see' God in his essential being, this language undoubtedly denotes that they were privileged to behold the visible sign, symbol, or demonstration of his presence, or in other words, the *Shekinah*, perhaps under a form of more distinctness, or circumstances of greater glory, than it had ever been revealed in before. It was unquestionably a similar appearance to that vouchsafed to Ezekiel, chap. 1. 26, of which he says, 'Above the firmament that was over their heads, having the appearance of a sapphire-stone, was the likeness of a throne, and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it.' The 'firmament' here spoken of as over the heads of the living creatures was not the celestial firmament, but a splendid flooring or substratum on which the visionary throne and its occupant rested, corresponding to the 'paved work of a sapphire stone,'

as it were a paved work of a <sup>n</sup>sapphire-stone, and as it were the <sup>o</sup>body of heaven in *his* clearness.

<sup>n</sup> Ezek. 1. 26. & 10. 1. Rev. 4. 3. <sup>o</sup> Matt. 17. 2.

mentioned by Moses. But it will be proper, in a passage of this nature to give the ancient versions, in which the reader will perceive the most distinct recognition of the *Shekinah*, as we have elsewhere represented it. Gr. 'And they saw the place where the God of Israel had stood, and under his feet as it were the work of a sapphire-brick, and as it were the appearance of the firmament of heaven in the purity thereof. And of the chosen of Israel there perished not one, and they were seen in the place of God, and ate and drank.' Chal. 'And they saw the glory of the God of Israel, and under the throne of his glory as the work of a precious stone, and as the aspect of heaven when it is serene. But to the princes of the sons of Israel no injury accrued; and they saw the Glory of God, and rejoiced in the sacrifices, which were accepted, as if they had eaten and drank.' Arab. 'And they saw the Angel of the God of Israel, and under him something similar to the whiteness of adamant, and like to heaven itself in its serenity. And against the princes of the sons of Israel he sent not forth his stroke, and they saw the Angel of the Lord, and lived, and ate, and drank.' Syr. 'And they saw the God of Israel, and under his feet as it were the work of a sapphire-brick, and as it were the color of heaven when it is serene. And against the elders of the sons of Israel he did not extend his hand; yea, they saw God, and ate and drank.' Sam. 'And they saw the God of Israel, and under his feet as it were a brick-work of sapphire, and as heaven itself in its purity. Nor yet against the elect ones of the children of Israel did he send forth his hand, but they clave unto God, and ate and drank.'



It will be observed that both in the sacred text, and in these several versions, there is a studied obscurity as to the form and aspect of the object whose resting or standing place is so gorgeously described. Yet from a comparison of this passage with the vision of Ezekiel, ch. 1, of which it is unquestionably the germ, there is some reason to think it was an *approximation* to the human form, as he says, that above the firmament that was over their heads, having the appearance of a sapphire stone, there was the likeness of a throne, and 'upon the likeness of the throne the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it.' Even here, however, the description is so worded as to leave the image in the mind of the reader designedly vague and shadowy, lest a foundation should be laid for an idolatrous abuse of the symbolical scenery depicted. While, therefore, the idea of a *distinct* personal appearance in human form is excluded, yet we may perhaps safely conceive that the luminous and glorious object presented to their view bore a *remote semblance* of such a form; nor does it militate with this supposition that Moses says, in describing the phenomena of Sinai, 'ye saw no manner of similitude;' for this was spoken concerning the people in general, at the time of their receiving the law in an audible voice from the mount; but the words before us relate to a few individuals, and what they saw on a subsequent occasion. It is said of Moses, Num. 12. 8, 'the similitude of the Lord shall he behold,' and as this vision had a direct reference to Christ, who is 'the image of the invisible God,' and yet 'made in the likeness of corruptible man,' we seem to perceive an intrinsic probability in the idea of his appearing on this occasion, in at least a *faint resemblance* to that human form in which he was afterwards to manifest himself in accomplishing the work of redemption.

Still we do not insist on this interpretation. It may be sufficient to say this was a most resplendent display of the divine glory in that form in which the Shekinah usually appeared, only perhaps in a milder and more mitigated splendor; for it seems clear that its usual aspect was that of an exceedingly bright and dazzling effulgence, increasing on some occasions to the intensity of a glowing and devouring flame. It is clear that the object seen could not have been God in the unveiled glory of his Godhead, for him no man hath seen nor can see. It must have been that *sensible manifestation* of the Deity which we have so frequently designated by the term Shekinah, and which we have endeavored to prove to be uniformly the Old Testament adumbration of Christ. It is unquestionably the same object as that mentioned by Isaiah, ch. 6. 1, 'In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, &c.;' for it was only as manifested in the Shekinah that 'the Lord' (i. e. Jehovah) was ever seen under the old dispensation. It is the same object also as that described in the vision of Ezekiel, ch. 43. 1, 2, 'Afterward he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looketh toward the east; and, behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east; and his voice was like the noise of many waters, and the earth shined with his glory.' The personage is evidently the same; it was the 'God of Israel,' whose theophany is described by both; and as Ezekiel is here prophetically setting forth the scenery of the New Jerusalem, we see no reason to doubt that the spectacle witnessed by Moses was the germ of that portrayed by Ezekiel, and that that depicted by John was merely a farther expansion of the same symbolical embryo. But leaving us to form our own ideas as to this part of the vision, the historian is more particular in describing the footstool upon

11 And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he p laid not his

Pch. 19. 21.

which the visible Divine Majesty rested.

—¶ *Under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone.* Heb. כַּמְעֵשֶׁה לְבִנַת הַסַּפִּיר

*kema'üseh libnath hassappir, as the work of brick of sapphire.*

That is, a tessellated pavement, apparently constructed of solid blocks of transparent sapphire moulded into the shape and size of bricks. The sapphire is a precious stone of a sky-colored hue, next in value and beauty to the diamond, and there seems to be an allusion to this gorgeous substratum of the throne of the divine glory in the prophet's words, Is. 54. 11, 'I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires.' In order to make the impression of its appearance still more distinct, it is compared to the 'body of heaven in its clearness.' That is to say, it had the aspect of the azure vault of heaven as seen in its pure native splendor, when the atmosphere is serene and unclouded. The eye then seems to behold the naked body, as it were, or the very substance of the heavenly ether. The whole spectacle, viewed merely as a sensible phenomenon, must have been beautiful and glorious beyond conception; but its glory in this respect would no doubt be far eclipsed by that of its symbolical import, could we but adequately grasp it.

11. *And upon the nobles, &c.* Heb. אֲצִלִּים *atzelim, magnates, optimates, the chief-men, the grandees;* evidently denoting the select and favored persons above mentioned, who are here probably called 'nobles' from the honor now conferred upon them of being admitted to witness such a spectacle; as if the splendor of the divine presence *ennobled* every thing that came within its sphere. By the 'hand' of Jehovah's 'not being laid upon them' is doubt-

less meant, that they received no harm from this amazing manifestation. Contrary to the usual impression in regard to the effect of such displays of the divine glory, which were thought to be fatal to the beholder, they saw God and lived. That this is the genuine sense of the phrase will appear from the following passages; Gen. 37. 22, 'And Reuben said unto them, Shed no blood, but cast him into this pit which is in the wilderness, and *lay no hand upon him;*' i. e. do no violence to him. Ps. 138. 7, 'Though I walk in the midst of trouble, thou wilt revive me; *thou shalt stretch forth thine hand against the wrath of mine enemies,* and thy right hand shall save me.' Neh. 13. 21, 'Then I testified against them and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the wall? if ye do so again, *I will lay hands on you.*' Ps. 55. 20, 'He hath put forth his hand against such as be at peace with him.'—¶ *Also they saw God, and did eat and drink.* Heb. רִיחוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים

q ver. 10. ch. 33. 20. Gen. 16. 13. & 32. 30. Deut. 4. 33. Judg. 13. 22. r Gen. 31. 54. ch. 18. 12. 1 Cor. 10. 18.

*va-yehezu eth ha-Elohim, and they saw the Elohim.* It is particularly worthy of notice, that the original here adopts a different term for 'seeing' from that which occurs in the preceding verse—'they saw (יָרֶאוּ *yiru*) the God of Israel,' as if *that* were intended to refer to the mere *outward, ocular, and superficial* view of the object as at first beheld. Here on the other hand, the verb is חָזַה *hazah*, a term applied for the most part to *prophetic vision*, or that kind of inward and spiritual perception which was enjoyed by holy and inspired men when in a state of supernatural trance or extacy. In this state the exercise of the outward senses was usually suspended, and the objects seen were presented as pictures to the imagination, the full significancy of which were not

always made known to the beholder. In the present instance we cannot affirm that the ordinary functions of the eye were, after a time, superseded, but we have no doubt that their minds were gradually raised and sublimated by a special divine influence, so that they were made the subjects of a manifestation or revelation far beyond any thing which their unaided faculties were capable of attaining. They were under an illapse of the Spirit of God, and like Balaam 'saw the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but (probably) having their eyes open.' In this entranced and extatic state 'they saw God;' i. e. they had a prophetic view of the Shekinah, the symbol of the divine presence, not only in the form in which it might strike the senses, but in its hidden interior import and significance, as pointing to that divine personage who was now involved in it and in future to be developed out of it, first in the substantiated form of human flesh, as the Son of God, humbled, suffering, and dying for the sins of men; and secondly and chiefly as risen, glorified, and again manifested on earth in the splendor and magnificence of his second coming and his eternal kingdom. It is, we doubt not, to this future and consummated glory of the Redeemer, made again visible and taking up its abode among men, that the symbol of the Shekinah always points. Its manifestation to Israel of old was preintimative of its renewed appearance and establishment in more sublime and glorious state to the subjects of the gospel economy in its ulterior periods, as set forth in the splendid predictions of Isaiah and the Apocalypse. It is only in the realization of all that was shadowed by the Shekinah that we are to look for the fulfilment of the assurance ratified by 'a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, *the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God*

himself shall be with them, and be their God.'

This, we are aware, is language that the Christian world have somehow come to interpret vaguely of heaven considered as a state removed to an unknown distance both of time and space from the state in which our present lot is cast; but we have greatly mistaken the drift of the oracles of God, if the conviction does not eventually grow upon the church, that it is in fact a *future* and an *earthly* state, a state to be gradually evolved out of the existing order of things, and to the development of which every Christian is bound unceasingly and strenuously to consecrate his efforts. So far as the *heaven* of the Scriptures is identical with the New Jerusalem, the celestial city, it is certainly *future*, for *that* is future. It is a state which is to be the *result* of a great system of influences and providences, now in operation, which God has designed shall precede and introduce it. It is an economy or polity which is said to 'come down from God out of heaven,' because it is to be developed into being *in pursuance of a divine plan,—as the execution of a scheme or program of which God in his revealed word is the Author*. In like manner, it might not improperly be said that the Tabernacle and all its apparatus came down from God out of heaven, because Moses constructed it all according to the pattern shown him in the mount. We suppose that it was with a view to impart a prophetic intimation of this great futurity, that the present vision was vouchsafed and recorded; and that a similar end was contemplated in the similar disclosures made to Isaiah, to Ezekiel, to Daniel, and to John. They all point forward to the blissful period referred to in the annunciation, 'the tabernacle of God shall be with men,' that is, his Shekinah, his *manifested presence*, shall be with men; not only with men in their raised and

glorified and angelic bodies, but also with men in their human flesh, living and sojourning on the earth while this resplendent throne of Jehovah has its seat in the midst of them. And this view, we conceive, affords the true clue to the introduction of the remarkable circumstance mentioned in close connexion with that of the vision with which Moses and the elders were favored, viz., that 'they did eat and drink.' Even granting, as is very probably the case, that this eating and drinking was upon the peace-offerings and the libations which accompanied the ratification of the covenant, yet who is not struck by the juxta-position of things apparently so remote from each other in their own nature, as witnessing a vision of God and satisfying the gross appetites of the physical man? Who does not feel it to be a kind of violent transition from the Spirit to the flesh? But suppose the incident to be viewed as having, like the rest, a prophetic bearing—suppose it be a typical intimation of the fact, that eating and drinking, that is, *enjoying the conditions of our present humanity*, are not in themselves inconsistent with the visible indwelling of the Most High on earth which we are taught to expect, and do we not find a sufficient explanation of the mystery? If the vision here recorded were truly in its ultimate scope, prophetic, and pointed to an era when the glory displayed to the congregation at Sinai should be far more illustriously displayed over the face of the earth, while the race was yet sojourning upon it, would it not be natural that some hint should be afforded of the intrinsic compatibility of such a manifestation with such a mode of subsistence?

In the foregoing remarks we have stated one, and, as we conceive, a prominent one, of the designs of God in granting to his servants this signal manifestation of his glory. But this, we apprehend, was not all. Admitting

that such an ultimate scope as we have now supposed was in fact couched under the vision, it would be natural that a system of rites, types, and shadows should be instituted, adapted to represent and keep vividly before the minds of the chosen people, the *grand end* which infinite wisdom thus proposed to itself eventually to accomplish. To this the Tabernacle with its various furniture and services, was eminently adapted. This sacred and symbolical structure, with all its appurtenances, was to be erected under the superintendence of Moses, and that in conformity to a model divinely given. We are expressly informed that he was to 'make every thing after the pattern shown him in the mount.' This pattern we suppose to have been shown him on this occasion; and probably one main reason of admitting Aaron and the elders to a participation of the vision, was, that by beholding the pattern they might bear witness to the fidelity of the copy. Otherwise, what evidence could Moses give to the people that he was acting in obedience to a divine command in erecting such a structure, of so strange a form and so costly a character? Would the congregation have parted so readily with their treasures, their gold and silver and jewels, unless upon the strongest assurance to their own minds that in so doing they were fulfilling an express requisition of Jehovah? The presence of the elders would give this assurance, and we therefore deem it reasonable to presume that the phenomena of the vision included the entire typical apparatus of the Tabernacle, and especially that of the Ark of the Covenant, the Mercy-seat, and the Cherubim, which were in fact the very heart and nucleus of the entire system, and of the import of which we shall speak more fully in a subsequent Note. In all probability the visible object termed the 'God of Israel' was faithfully but feebly shadowed out in the

12 ¶ And the LORD said unto Moses, <sup>s</sup> Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee <sup>t</sup> tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I

<sup>s</sup> ver. 2. 15, 18. <sup>t</sup> ch. 31. 18. & 32. 15. 16. Deut. 5. 22.

cloud of glory and the accompanying Cherubim which surmounted the Mercy-seat, except that the sapphire pavement was exchanged, for uniformity's sake, for one of burnished gold. As to the attendant angelic hosts, which seem to have been conceived of as an unfailing accompaniment of the Glory, and which they probably saw, since they could not be materialized in their multitude, the Cherubic device was adopted as a mystic embodiment of this order of beings. But of this more in the sequel. If our suggestions in regard to the remarkable incident here recorded be well founded, and this were the time when these 'patterns of things in the heavens' were shown to Moses, it will follow that the account here given of the vision is extremely incomplete, embracing the mention merely of the leading and most memorable object which they were favored to behold. This we infer from the fact that Moses is said to have made every thing according to the pattern shown him in the mount. But as he made many things which he is not expressly said to have seen, we may fairly conclude that he does not describe all that he did see.

12. *Come up to me into the Mount, &c.* Thus far it would appear that Moses had remained with his company at some station part way up the mountain, where the vision was vouchsafed, but he is now commanded to leave his companions, and advance towards the cloud that rested on the summit, and 'to be there,' i. e. to remain there some considerable time. The design of the summons is stated to be, that he might receive the engraved tables of the law,

have written; that thou mayest teach them.

13 And Moses rose up, and <sup>u</sup> his minister Joshua: and Moses <sup>w</sup> went up into the mount of God.

<sup>u</sup> ch. 32. 17. & 33. 11. <sup>w</sup> ver. 2.

containing that divine code which he was to teach to the people, for it is to the people, and not to the commandments, that the pronoun 'them' refers.

13. *And his minister Joshua.* Heb. מְשָׁרֶתוֹ *mesharetho*, his ministering attendant. The root שָׂרַת *sharath* denotes a personal attendance and ministry less servile than that which is indicated by the term עָבַד *abad*, to serve. It points rather to that honorary attendance which is paid by a courtier to his sovereign or prince, than the menial obsequiousness of a slave to his master. See Note on Num. 11. 28. It was undoubtedly with a view to his future office, that Joshua was called to sustain this relation to Moses. He was to be his successor as leader of Israel, and it was fitting that he should begin by degrees to be honored before the congregation, that they might be led the more readily and cordially to render to him the deference and respect to which his station would one day entitle him. This could scarcely fail to be the result when they saw him admitted nearer to the manifested presence of God than any other individual except Moses himself. We must be strangely insensible to the tokens of the divine will not to honor those whom God himself honors. — ¶ *And Moses went up into the mount of God.* Chal. 'Into the mountain on which the Glory of the Lord was revealed.' Targ. Jon. 'Into the mountain in which the Glorious Presence of the Lord was manifested.' Moses and Joshua went up to the higher parts of the mountain, where in all probability the lower extremities or fringes of the dark enveloping cloud

14 And he said unto the elders, Tarry ye here for us, until we come again unto you : and behold, Aaron

embosomed them in its sombre folds. The bright interior cloud of the Glory seems to have been still higher up on the very apex of the mount, and to have been only occasionally disclosed to the sight of the congregation. The common spectacle, we suppose, was that of a dark majestic mass of cloud, within which, but invisible, the splendor of the Shekinah abode. Here it would seem that Moses and Joshua remained together for six days, pavilioned within the lower descending outskirts of the cloud, engaged in holy conference and fervent devotion, till on the seventh, perhaps the sabbath day, Moses was ordered to leave Joshua, as they had both left the elders below, and ascend up to the topmost summit of the hallowed mount, where the divine presence was more especially enthroned. So in our upward moral progress, be our attainments what they may at present, we are still to aim at something higher. Our arrival at one eminence still leaves us at the foot of another, which equally claims to be climbed, and until we reach heaven itself we must expect to see,

'Hills peep o'er hills, and Alps on Alps arise.'

14. *Tarry ye here*, &c. Aware, probably, that his absence from the people was now to be of longer duration than usual, Moses deems it necessary to make special provision for the administration of justice, and the general management of the civil affairs of the people in the interval. For this end he commissions Aaron and Hur to act as his deputies in judging causes, and tells them, moreover, to remain where they were, advanced somewhat up the mountain, patiently awaiting his and Joshua's return. It is only thus that we can understand the plain language of the

and Hur *are* with you : if any man have any matters to do, let him come unto them.

text. Commentators indeed have supposed that as the people were to have constant resort to them on matters of business, and as Aaron is spoken of as engaged in the midst of the congregation in making the golden calf, the order was for the elders to remain, not in the exact spot where Moses left them, but in the camp at the base of the mountain, in the midst of the people. But this is surely doing manifest violence to the letter of the narrative ; and besides, if this were the sense, what need were there of any command at all ; for where else *should* they tarry but in the camp ? Was there any danger of their going away from it ? The truth is, if we mistake not, they were expressly required to abide in the spot where they had enjoyed the vision till Moses returned. To this spot such of the people as 'had matters to do' were permitted and directed to come as often as they had occasion for judicial decisions ; and we think that the first step in Aaron's sin was his deserting his post, and going down, contrary to Moses' direction, into the midst of the camp. He was probably infected by the contagion of the people's impatience before he yielded his consent to join in their idolatry ; thus affording us a melancholy example of the ruinous effects of a single step in the way of transgression. No man knows where he may be landed by the slightest aberration from the path of duty. Neither the foot nor the face can be safely turned away from the post assigned us. Aaron slid down the mountain both in a moral and physical sense at the same time.—¶ *Behold, Aaron and Hur are with you.* This was spoken to the elders, but to the elders as the representatives of the people, and so in a sense sustaining their persons. The people, therefore,

15 And Moses went up into the mount, and <sup>x</sup>a cloud covered the mount.

16 And <sup>y</sup>the glory of the LORD abode upon mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days: and the seventh day he called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud.

<sup>x</sup> ch. 19. 9, 16. Matt. 17. 5. <sup>y</sup> ch. 16. 10. Numb. 14. 10.

were to consider themselves as addressed in the address made to their official heads. This is according to the usual analogy of the Scripture idiom, of which we shall find hundreds of examples.—

¶ *If any man have any matters to do.* Heb. *מי בעל דברים* *mi baal debarim*, *whoso is lord or master of words* (things, matters). Gr. and Chal. 'Whoso hath a judgment or controversy.'

15. *And Moses went up into the mount,* &c. That is, Moses and Joshua together, as the whole narrative leads us to infer. For it was not till six days had elapsed that Moses was called to enter into the midst of the cloud resting on the highest peak of the mountain, and in the mean time we cannot but suppose that he and Joshua remained together. It no more follows that Joshua did not ascend with him, from his name not being mentioned, than it does that he is not to be associated with Moses in the final clause of v. 13, where any one can see that such an inference would be entirely erroneous.

16. *And the glory of the Lord abode,* &c. Heb. *ישכן* *yishkan*, *tabernacled*. From the same root *שכן* *shakan*, comes *Shekinah*, the etymology clearly indicating the relation of the visible glory of Jehovah to some kind of *tabernacle* as its appropriate dwelling place. In the present instance, we incline to believe that the dark cloud was the tabernacle in which the Glory was enshrined, and that this is expressly intimated in the ensuing words, 'the cloud covered it six days,' i. e. covered the Glory, and

17 And the sight of the glory of the LORD *was* like <sup>z</sup>devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel.

18 And Moses went into the midst of the cloud, and gat him up into the mount: and <sup>a</sup>Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights.

<sup>z</sup> ch. 3. 2. & 19. 18. Deut. 4. 36. Hebr. 12. 18. 29. <sup>a</sup> ch. 34. 28. Deut. 9. 9.

not the mountain; for thus the original may fairly be interpreted. It is, indeed true that nearly all the ancient versions render it, 'covered him,' i. e. Moses, but the other sense is agreeable to the original, and were a *personal* object intended, we think it more probable the plural 'them' would have been employed, as there can be no doubt that Moses and Joshua were now together, and both enshrouded within the borders of the cloudy crown which covered the brow of the mountain. On the seventh day the divine summons called Moses up to the utmost heights of the mountain, and then we suppose the dark thick cloud was rent and opened in the sight of all Israel, and the inner glory broke forth like devouring fire. In the midst of this opened cloud, Moses was enabled boldly to enter, although to the multitude below it probably had the appearance of entering into the mouth of a fiery furnace, which threatened instantaneous destruction. But Moses was one whom the special favor of heaven enabled to 'dwell even with this devouring fire,' without either a hair of his head, or a thread of his garments, feeling the action of the consuming element. There he continued fasting forty days and forty nights, receiving further instructions, and no doubt enjoying the most transporting discoveries of the divine glory. The six days mentioned, v. 16, were probably not a part of the forty; for during those six days Moses and Joshua were together, and both probably ate of manna as usual, and

drank of the brook mentioned Deut. 9. 21; but when Moses was called into the midst of the cloud, his forty days fasting commenced, while Joshua, in the mean time, no doubt continued to eat and drink daily while waiting for Moses' return.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### THE TABERNACLE.

As we enter in the present chapter upon the directions given to Moses for the erection and furnishing of the sacred structure called *the Tabernacle*, it will be proper to dwell a little in the outset upon the grand design of an edifice so remarkable in itself, and holding so prominent a place in the Mosaic economy. The Tabernacle was, in fact, the central object in the Jewish system of worship, and without a tolerably correct idea of its form, uses, and ends, our view of the genius and scope of the Hebrew ritual will be essentially defective. It may perhaps be admitted, that as some of these ends were of typical import, pointing forward to a period of the Christian dispensation which has not yet been fully developed, we may not be able to unfold, in all its fullness, in the present state of our knowledge, the entire reach of meaning which in the divine mind was couched under this significant structure, and its successor the Temple. Yet with the lights reflected upon it from the expositions of the New Testament and the predictions of the Old, we may doubtless attain to an interesting and edifying insight into its leading drift. We are persuaded that it is a study fraught with the most important practical results, and though generally considered, like the other symbolical portions of the Scriptures, as constituting a field of mere curious, fanciful, and speculative research, yet we cannot question that this opinion will be ere long entirely reversed by a deeper reverence for every

part of revelation subordinating to itself the irrepressible spirit of inquiry which is pervading every department of knowledge whether scientific or sacred, natural or supernatural. The book of revelation, like the book of nature, is designed to be of gradual development, and we know not why it is not as reasonable to look for the opening of new mines of scriptural wealth, as of new mineral treasures, that have been imbedded for ages in the bowels of the earth.—But to the point which we have more immediately in hand.

The opinion has been widely entertained, that in the early ages of the world, under the impression of the grand truth that 'God is a spirit, and that they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth,'—that this divine spirit filled all things, and was equally present in all parts of his creation—men had no *sacred places*, but worshipped God wherever and whenever their hearts were drawn forth towards him in veneration, gratitude, or love. To the soundness of this opinion thus broadly expressed, we are disposed to object, on the same grounds on which we object to the theory that makes the primitive state of man a *savage state*. *It is not, we conceive, in accordance with the recorded facts of inspired history.* We cannot but conclude, from the tenor of the sacred narrative, that from the creation of Adam to the present time, God has dealt with man by way of *express revelation*. The infancy of the race was cradled in the midst of supernatural disclosures, and the light of the divine *manifestations* continued to shine with brighter or dimmer beams upon its advancing youth and manhood, up to the riper age which it has now attained. With the record of Genesis before us we cannot question that Jehovah manifested himself between the Cherubims at the east of the garden of Eden, and that this earliest exhibition of the Shekinah was the *appointed*



*place of worship* for Adam and his family, the place to which Cain and Abel brought their oblations, and the place from which Cain, after the murder of his brother, retired in miserable exile, when he is said to have fled from the presence of the Lord. True it is, that the major part of the race lapsed, by a very early defection, into the grossest idolatry, and the *visible symbols* of the divine presence, if enjoyed at all, were confined to a select few; but we know not that we are warranted in the belief that the knowledge of the true God, or of the right mode of worshipping him, has at any time become entirely extinct on earth. As a matter, however, of historical fact it is unquestionable that most of the early nations of the world, under the promptings of a religious principle, rendered their worship, such as it was, in a vague and informal manner, without temple or ritual, to the invisible Deity in whom they were taught to believe. It was not unnatural that in these circumstances they should have selected the tops of mountains and the shade of groves as the seat of their worship, and there fixed their altars for sacrifice. But in process of time, as men sank deeper and deeper into idolatry, the practice of worshipping on high places and in groves became associated with so many vile abominations, that it was utterly forbidden to the Israelites, to whom God was pleased to prescribe a *localized* worship, first within the precincts of a Tabernacle, and afterwards of a Temple. The Tabernacle was little else than a portable temple; as no other kind of structure would have suited the earlier circumstances of the chosen race. A nomade people would of course have a moveable temple; and, among a tent-dwelling people, that temple would naturally be a tent or a portable fabric of wood. An immoveable temple could only be expected to be found among a settled race; and when a moving people become set-

tled, and exchange their tents for houses, in like manner their moveable tabernacles become fixed temples. 'See now,' said David, 'I dwell in a house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth between curtains.' He therefore proposed that the house of God should no longer be a tent, but a fabric of stone, in accordance with the altered circumstances of the people. But until the Israelites were settled in the land of promise, their sacred edifice, if they had one, must necessarily be such as they could easily take to pieces and transfer from place to place. The object of such a building was not, like that of our churches, as a place of shelter for the assembled worshippers, for the worshippers assembled not in the temples, but in the courts before or around them; nor yet as places for offering sacrifices, for the sacrifices were also offered in the courts. Its true design was as a *mansion of the Deity, a dwelling-place for the divine presence*. This was especially and preeminently the object of the Jewish Tabernacle. It was intended as a habitation of the visible symbol of Jehovah, or the Shekinah, as the God and King of the chosen people, who, as we have seen above, is emphatically designated 'the God of Israel.'

In ordering the construction of such a building, we may admit that there was an accommodation to ideas then very universally prevalent, and which from their residence in Egypt had become familiar to the minds of the Israelites. The Egyptians and other heathen nations boasted of the presence of their gods among them in their temples and tabernacles; and as God had been pleased from the earliest periods to reveal himself to the patriarchs by visible manifestation, it was not unnatural that he should at length confer upon his people the permanent tokens of a peculiar local presence in some such striking and glorious symbol as that of the Shekinah. With this view

he directed the Tabernacle to be erected as a suitable abode for his visible majesty. As such it possessed the twofold character of a *Sanctuary*, or *holy place*, a *place of worship*; and of a *Royal Palace*; where he would keep the state of a court, as supreme civil magistrate and king of Israel; from whence he would issue his laws and commandments as from an oracle, and where he was to receive the homage and tribute of his subjects. This idea of the Tabernacle, as in part that of a *palace for a king*, will seem perfectly clear to every one who carefully notes the terms in which this building and also the Temple are spoken of and referred to throughout the Scriptures; and we doubt not it is a view essential to the right understanding of these structures and the things which belonged to them. It is a view also which is held by the Jews themselves, who carry out the analogy and regard the utensils of the Tabernacle as *palace furniture* and the priests as its ministers of state and officers. Take, for instance, the following comment of Rab. Shem Tob on Maimonides as cited by Outram on Sacrifices, Diss. I. § 3. 'God, to whom be praise, commanded a house to be built for him resembling a royal palace. In a royal palace are to be found all the things that we have mentioned. There are some persons who guard the palace; others who execute offices belonging to the royal dignity, who furnish the banquets, and do other necessary services for the monarch; others who daily entertain him with music, both vocal and instrumental. In a royal palace there is a place appointed for the preparation of victuals, and another [nearer the Presence] where perfumes are burned. In the palace of a king there is also a table, and an apartment exclusively appropriated to himself, which no one ever enters, except him who is next in authority, or those whom he regards with the greatest affection. In like

manner it was the will of God to have all these in his house, that he might not in anything give place to the kings of the earth. For he is a great king, not indeed in want of these things: but hence it is easy to see the reason of the daily provisions given to the priests and Levites, being what every monarch is accustomed to allow his servants. And all these things were intended to instruct the people that the Lord of Hosts was present among us, 'For he is a great king, and to be feared by all the nations.' These analogies will be the more apparent when it is remembered that the comparisons are to be referred to an Oriental rather than a European palace.

We do not, however, consider it sufficient to regard such a view of the Tabernacle as founded solely upon the usages of royalty as *then* existing. We are satisfied that its *typical* design is necessary to account for those features which it possessed in common with the palaces of kings. The Glory that dwelt both in the Tabernacle and the Temple was preintimative of the even yet future manifested glory of Christ, to which the 'earnest expectation of the creature' has been long looking forward, and of which the incipient dawns begin now faintly to appear. The import of the ancient visible Shekinah and its material habitation has never yet been realized as it is destined to be in the latter day on earth; nor do we conceive it possible to gain a full and adequate idea of the *kingly* features of this typical establishment without looking forward to the time when the Savior, combining sacerdotal sanctity with royal dignity, shall sit 'a *priest* upon his *throne*,' in the earthly Zion, in accordance with the entire drift of the Old Testament prophecies. This is the state to which the anticipations of all Christians are *really* directed—a state which is to be ultimately evolved out of the present by a stupendous order of changes,

moral, political, and physical. The New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse is the grand object of the Christian's hope, and it is in that glorious dispensation, the theatre of which is the earth that we now inhabit, that we are to look for the *substantial realities* so strikingly figured in the ritual apparatus of the old economy. It is the state constituted by the final developement of the Kingdom of Heaven out of the regenerated and transferred dominions and dynasties of the earth, over which Jesus Christ is to reign in *visible majesty*, his redeemed people being made, in some way at present inscrutable to us, to share with him in the beatitudes and glories of his eternal kingship. It is in that dispensation, or perhaps we may say, in that stage of *this* dispensation, that the things mystically foreshown by the Tabernacle structure and the Tabernacle furniture will be made real. It will then appear how admirably adapted it was in its twofold character of Sanctuary and Palace to correspond with the twofold functions of Christ as Priest and King. But the farther unfolding of this view of the subject would carry us imperceptibly into the region of prophetic exposition, which our present plan does not embrace.

The detailed and minute account which we propose to give of every part of the Tabernacle may be prefaced with the following general description, for the most part in the words of the Editor of the Pictorial Bible. First there was the area or court in which the Tabernacle stood. This was of an oblong figure of a hundred cubits (about 150 feet) long, by fifty cubits (about 75 feet) broad; and the height of the inclosing curtain was five cubits or nearly three yards, being half the height of the Tabernacle. The inclosure was formed by a plain hanging of fine twined linen yarn, which seems to have been worked in an open or net-work texture, so that the people without might freely

see the interior. The door-curtain was however of a different texture from the general hanging, being a great curtain of 'fine twined linen,' embroidered with blue, purple, and scarlet. It is described in precisely the same terms as the door-curtain of the Tabernacle itself, which was not, as commonly stated, of the same fabric with the inner covering of the Tabernacle, and the veil before the holy of holies; for in the description of the two door-curtains there is no mention of the figures of cherubim and the fancy work ('cunning work') which decorated the inner covering and vail. The door-curtain of the court was furnished with cords, by which it might be drawn up or aside when the priests had occasion to enter. The curtains of this inclosure were hung upon sixty pillars of brass, standing on bases of the same metal, but with capitals and fillets of silver. (Compare the description in this chapter with that in chap. 38.) The hooks also, to which the curtains were attached, were of silver. The entrance of the court was at the east end, opposite that to the Tabernacle; and between them stood the altar of burnt offering, but nearer to the door of the Tabernacle than to that of the court. It is uncertain whether the brazen laver was interposed between the altar and the door of the Tabernacle or not. Chap. 30. 18, certainly conveys that impression; but the Rabbins, who appear to have felt that nothing could properly interpose between the altar and Tabernacle, say that the laver was indeed nearer to the Tabernacle than was the altar, but still that it did not stand in the same line with the altar, but stood a little on one side to the south. As to the position of the Tabernacle in the court, nothing is said in the Scriptures on the subject, but it seems less probable that it stood in the centre than that it was placed towards the farther or western extremity, so as to allow greater space for the services which

were to be performed exclusively in front of the Tabernacle.

The fabric properly called the Tabernacle having moveable walls of board, was of a more substantial character than a tent; but it is right to regard it as a tent, its general appearance and arrangement being the same, and its more substantial fabric being probably on account of the weight of its several envelopes which required stronger supports than are usually necessary. It was of an oblong figure, fifty-five feet in length, by eighteen feet in breadth and height. Its length extended from east to west, the entrance being at the east end. The two sides and west end consisted of a framework of boards, of which there were twenty on each side and eight at the west end. The manner in which these boards were joined to each other so as to form a wall which might be easily taken down and set up again, may be illustrated in some degree by a reference to the window-shutters of an extensive shop; but the boards of the Tabernacle did not slide in grooves, but each was furnished at the bottom with two tenons, which were received into sockets in the bases of solid silver; and to give the whole greater security, the boards were furnished each with five rings or staples of gold, by means of which they were successively run up to their proper places on horizontal poles or bars, which served as the ribs of the fabric, binding its parts together. The boards as well as the bars were of shittim wood, overlaid with thin plates of gold. The east end, being the entrance, had no boards, but was furnished with five pillars of shittim wood overlaid with gold, and each standing on a socket of brass. Four similar pillars within the Tabernacle, towards the west or further end, supported a rich hanging, which divided the interior into two apartments, of which the outer was called 'the holy place,' and the innermost and smallest

was 'the most holy place,' or the 'Holy of Holies,' in which the presence of the Lord was more immediately manifested. The separating hanging was called, by way of eminence, 'the vail;' and hence the expression 'within' or 'without the vail' is sometimes used to distinguish the most holy from the holy place. The people were never admitted into the interior of the tabernacle. None but the priests might go even into the outer chamber or holy place, and into the inner chamber the high-priest alone was allowed to enter, and that only once in the year, on the great day of atonement. To this, however, there was a necessary exception when the Tabernacle was to be taken down or set up. The outer chamber was only entered in the morning to offer incense on the altar which stood there, and to extinguish the lamps, and again in the evening to light them. On the Sabbath also the old shew-bread was taken away and replaced with new. These were all the services for which the attendance of the priests was necessary within the Tabernacle, all the sacrifices being made in the open space in front of the Tabernacle, where stood the brazen altar for burnt offerings. It will be useful to observe, that the most holy place contained only the ark with its contents; that the outer apartment contained the altar of incense, the table of shew-bread, and the great golden candlestick; while the open area in front of the Tabernacle contained the brazen laver for the ablutions of the priests, and the brazen altar for burnt offerings.

This description will give an idea of the general arrangement and substantial structure of the Tabernacle; and we may proceed to notice the various curtains which were thrown over and formed the outer coverings of the tent. The first or inner covering was of fine linen, splendidly embroidered with figures of cherubim and fancy work in scarlet, purple, and light blue. It is

## CHAPTER XXV.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 Speak unto the children of Israel that they bring me an offer-


described in the same terms as the vail of the 'holy of holies,' and was doubtless of the same texture and appearance with the vail, which, according to Josephus, was embroidered with all sorts of flowers, and interwoven with various ornamented figures, excepting the forms of animals. Over this inner covering was another, made of goats' hair, which was spun by the women of the camp. Cloth made of goats' hair forms the customary covering for the tents of the Bedouin Arabs to this day, and it still continues to be spun and woven at home by the women. Over this covering was another of rams' skins dyed red, and over that the fourth and

ing: <sup>a</sup> of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering.

<sup>a</sup> ch. 35. 5, 21. 1 Chron. 29. 3, 5, 9, 14. Ezra 2. 68. & 3. 5. & 7. 16. Neh. 11. 2. 2 Cor. 8. 12. & 9. 7.

outermost covering of tahash skins (see the Note on chap. 25. 5). These curtains, after covering, or rather forming, the roof, hung down by the sides and west end of the Tabernacle, those that were outside being calculated to protect the more costly ones within, while the whole combined to render the Tabernacle impervious to the rain, and safe from the injuries of the weather.

The annexed cut will give to the reader somewhat of an adequate idea of the *frame work* of the Tabernacle, while we have reserved to a subsequent Note, ch. 26. 14, a view of the structure in its completed state with its envelope of curtains.



THE FRAME-WORK OF THE TABERNACLE.

2. *Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me, &c.* Heb. *וְיָקְחוּ לִי* *va-yikhu li*, *that they take for me*. The original word for 'take' very frequently has the import of *take and bring, take and give, or take and offer*. Thus Gen. 15. 9, '*Take me an heifer of three years old;*' i. e. *take and offer*. So Ps. 68. 18, '*Thou hast received gifts for men;*' Heb. '*thou hast taken;*' i. e. *in order to*

bestow them upon men, as expounded by the apostle, Eph. 4. 8, '*gave gifts unto men.*' Thus too 1 Kings, 3. 24, '*And the king said, Bring me a sword;*' Heb. '*take me a sword.*' 1 Kings, 17. 10, '*Fetch me a little water;*' Heb. '*take me a little water.*'—*An offering.* Heb. *תְּרוּמָה* *terumah*, *an elevation, a heave-offering*, so called from its being *lifted up* when it was laid on

3 And this is the offering which ye shall take of them; gold, and silver, and brass,

the altar in the act of presentation. Chal. 'Separate a separation before me;' that is, such things as they should be disposed to set apart from their effects and consecrate to the Lord. The original term comes from *רָם* *rum*, to lift up, to be lifted up, and is generally appropriated to sacrificial offerings, which were at least *lifted up* on the altar, if not previously *heaved* or *waved* in the air by way of oblation. It is elsewhere employed as a very general term for any thing *separated* and *made a donation* to God, and is applied, Ezek. 48. 9—20, even to the land which was to be sacredly devoted to God and the priests of the Temple, and which is rendered in our version 'oblation.' In this connexion it seems to imply, that the offerings thus voluntarily made under the promptings of a noble and liberal spirit, were as acceptable to God, as truly hallowed in his sight, as if they had been real sacrifices. Thus we read of good men offering 'sacrifices of praise.' It is no doubt with a view to intimate the same idea, that the Gr. and Vulg. render it 'first-fruits;' as if it would be deemed the *best* and *choicest* of every thing that they could offer. What is done from upright motives and in a generous spirit for God will always be sure of being rated and denominated as it deserves.—¶ *That giveth it willingly with his heart.* Heb. *אֲשֶׁר יִדְבֶנּוּ לִבּוֹ* *asher yiddebennu libbo*, whose heart moveth him to willingness, or liberality. The proposed oblation was neither to be exacted by compulsion nor regulated by prescription, but every one was left to give after the promptings of his own heart. Gr. 'Of all to whom it shall seem good in their hearts.' Vulg. 'Of every man that offereth of his own accord.' The original *נָדַב* *nadab* is frequently used in the sense of a *liberal*,

4 And blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair.

*voluntary, and free-hearted offering*, and the correlative derivative *נְדָבוֹת* *nedaboth* occurs with a parallel meaning Ps. 110. 3, 'Thy people shall be *willing* (*נְדָבוֹת* *nedaboth*, lit. *willingnesses*) in the day of the power;' where the drift of the Psalmist appears to be, to compare the abundance of the free-will offerings made to the Messiah in the latter day for the beautifying his sanctuary (*בְּחֻרְרֵי קֹדֶשׁ* *behadrë kodesh*, with the adornments of the holy) with the profusion of the gifts that were so largely poured forth at the setting up of the Tabernacle. They shall come forth as copiously as the drops of dew from the womb of the morning; in a bountifulness at least equal to that when the dew of its noble munificence was upon the youth of the Israelitish church. A very appropriate commentary on the present passage is afforded in the subsequent account of its execution, Ex. 35. 21, 22, 'And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing, and they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the Tabernacle of the congregation, and for all his service, and for the holy garments. And they came, both men and women, as many as were willing-hearted, and brought bracelets, and ear-rings, and rings, and tablets, all jewels of gold: and every man that offered, offered an offering of gold unto the Lord.' As the Lord loves a cheerful giver, so the spirit of a true servant of Jesus Christ prompts him to ask not only what he *must* do for his heavenly master, but what he *may* do. See a farther consideration of the conduct of the people on this occasion in the Note on Ex. 35. 29.

3. *Gold, and silver, and brass.* 'Here and elsewhere we find mentioned together, the metals which were procured

the earliest, and first applied to purposes of use and ornament. No other metals were employed in the construction of the Tabernacle, nor any others mentioned but in such slight allusions as to show that they were indeed known, but not in common use. The Hebrew has the same word for both *copper* and *brass*, but our translation always renders it by *brass*, even when the context shows that the simple metal (*copper*) is intended—as in Deut. 8. 9, ‘Out of whose hills thou mayest dig *brass*’—i. e. *copper*, brass being a compound factitious preparation. It is not always easy to distinguish where the word in the original denotes brass, and where copper. Perhaps we should always understand the latter in the more early passages where it occurs; and in later times we may assume that brass is intended where something refined and ornamental is implied in the text. The three metals, gold, silver, and copper, were naturally the first which men appropriated to their service; and the Scripture exhibits them as in use, and even abundant, in Egypt and Palestine a few ages after the flood. We know not precisely when these metals first became known; but at the time now immediately under our notice, the art of metallurgy had certainly attained considerable perfection; various personal ornaments, various utensils, and even images, of gold and silver, have already been often mentioned in the sacred text. It seems to our minds that a large mass of evidence in favor of the verity of the Pentateuch remains yet untouched—the evidence resulting from the perfect conformity of all its allusions to the state of the arts and the materials on which the arts operate, as well as the agreement of its statements concerning the condition of men, with the natural progress of men and of the arts they cultivate, and with the condition of things at the most early times of which profane history exhibits

any knowledge. Even the silence of the Pentateuch, as to particulars which a later writer than Moses could scarcely have failed to notice, is not the least valuable of the internal evidences which the book bears of its own antiquity and truth.’—*Pict. Bible*.

#### 4. *Blue, and purple, and scarlet.*

These are merely the names of certain colors, while no mention is made of the thing or things colored. But as we find from the apostle, Heb. 9. 19, that *scarlet wool* was employed in the sprinkling of blood, the probability is that *wool* of those colors is intended which was afterward fabricated by the women into the curtains of the Tabernacle; for however difficult it may be to conceive that they should have had in the wilderness the implements necessary to such a process, the following passage, Ex. 35. 26, puts it beyond a doubt; ‘And all the women whose spirit stirred them up in wisdom *spun goats’ hair*.’ Thus the Heb. doctors; ‘The blue spoken of in any place was wool dyed like the body of heaven; the scarlet, wool dyed in scarlet, &c.’—¶ *Blue*. Heb. תְּכֵלֶת *tekeleth*, blue, azure, sky-color. So Maimonides; ‘This color is like the firmament.’ Thus too in the Gemara (Menach. 4.) Rab. Meyr says, ‘Wherein differs the תְּכֵלֶת *tekeleth* from the other colors? Answer, because the תְּכֵלֶת *tekeleth* is like the sea, and the sea like the firmament, and the firmament like the throne of glory, as it is said, Ex. 24. 10, ‘Under his feet as it were sapphire bricks such as is the aspect of the serene heavens.’ Gr. ὑακινθός, *hyacinth*. This was a color distinguishing the dress of princes and potentates among the ancients, with whom the art of dyeing was carried to a high degree of perfection. The splendor and magnificence of dress seem to have consisted very much in the richness of colors, and the *blue*, which we learn from many passages of the Scriptures to have been in great request, was imported from re-

mote countries as an article of expensive and elegant luxury. It is supposed by some to have been the product of the *indigo*, a plant deriving its origin, as it doubtless does its name, from India, where its beautiful dyes have long given value to the fine linens and cottons of that ancient empire.—

¶ *Purple*. Heb. **אַרְגָּמָן** *argaman*, rendered *purple* by all the ancient versions. This is the name of a very precious color extracted from the *purpura*, or *murex*, a species of shell-fish, called in English *the purple*. This color, the same with the famous Tyrian dye, and the most celebrated of all the ancient dyes, is now lost, and it is doubted by many whether the moderns have any thing which equals it in richness and brilliancy. It is known, however, that the coloring juice of the *purple* was contained in a vessel found in the throat of the *murex*, and that only one drop of liquid was obtained from each. A sacred character was very early attached to the purple, and it was the predominant color in things pertaining to the worship of God among heathen nations. In modern times, although the Tyrian purple has been long lost, yet the pride of the name is still preserved in the sacerdotal hierarchy. It was also an attribute of exalted birth and of dignities. It served as a decoration to the first magistrates of Rome, and finally became a symbol of the inauguration of the emperors. To assume the 'imperial purple' was but another name for succeeding to the throne, and the punishment of death was at length decreed against any of inferior grade who should presume to wear the royal color. To this penalty it was undoubtedly owing that the art of dyeing purple gradually disappeared from among the nations of Europe. From the epithet 'purple' being applied by Homer and Virgil to blood, it is probable that this color anciently approached much nearer to scarlet than the modern purple. Indeed the two, in the

writings of the ancients, are frequently confounded together. And so also in the New Testament we find them interchanged, as Mark, 15. 17, 'they clothed him with *purple*,' compared with Mat 27. 28, 'they put on him a *scarlet robe*.' See also John, 19. 2. 'It is important, says the Editor of the Pictorial Bible 'to understand, that the word 'purple' in ancient writings does not denote one particular color. Pliny mentions the difference between some of the purples; one was faint, approaching to our scarlet, and this was the least esteemed; another was very deep approaching to violet; and a third was of a color compared to coagulated bullock's blood. The most esteemed Tyrian purple seems to have been of this last color. We say 'the most esteemed,' because it appears that even the Tyrian purple was not one particular color, but a class of animal dyes, as distinguished from vegetable, varying in shade from the most faint to the most intense.' The purple has been styled the most sublime of all earthly colors, having the gaudiness of the red, of which it retains a shade, softened with the gravity of the blue.—¶ *Scarlet*. Heb. **תוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי** *tolaath shani*, *worm of repetition*. This tincture or color is expressed by a word which signifies 'worm-color,' as 'vermillion,' comes from *vermiculus*, a little worm, from its being produced from a worm or insect which grew in a *coccus*, or excrescence of a shrub of the oak kind. This shrub is sometimes called the 'kermes-oak,' from 'kermes,' the Arabic word both for the worm and the color; whence the Latin 'carminis,' the French 'cramoisi,' and the English 'crimson.' The color produced from the *coccus* was a lively bright red, approaching to the hue of fire. In the original of the passage before us, the Heb. word **תוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי** *tolaath*, for the worm or coloring matter, is connected with 'Shani,' which signifies *repeated* or *double*, implying that to strike this



color the wool or cloth was twice dipped; hence the Vulgate renders the original 'coccum his tinctum,' *scarlet twice dyed*. The scarlet also was an honorable color, being that of the Roman emperors in time of war, while the purple was the raiment of peace. Accordingly in the book of Revelation the scarlet color, being that of blood, is a symbol of slaughter, and attributed especially to the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, who is represented, Rev. 18. 3, riding upon a beast of the same color, another symbol of a persecuting and sanguinary power. 'Professor Tyāsen, supposing the identity of the Scripture 'scarlet' with the *kermes* established, properly concludes that the kermes dye was known before the time of Moses;—that the dye was known to the Egyptians in the time of Moses; for the Israelites must have carried it along with them from Egypt;—that the Arabs received the name 'kermes,' with the dye, from Armenia and Persia, where it was indigenous, and had been long known; and that name banished the old name in the east, as the name 'scarlet' has in the west. *Kermes* signifies always *red dye*; and when pronounced short it becomes *deep red*. Beckmann thinks that in later times the Tyrian purples were superseded by the improvements of this dye; but we do not feel satisfied with his authorities for this conclusion. The *kermes* itself has now long been superseded by the American cochineal, which is far superior to any pigment employed in ancient times for dyeing reds. Indeed we have perhaps little cause to regret the loss or disuse of any ancient dye, particularly in bright reds, which owe so much to discoveries of chemistry, that we have every reason to conclude them infinitely superior to any which ancient art could produce. Pliny complains that scarlet dyes could not be made sufficiently durable and adhesive; and the statements in ancient au-

thors as to the brilliancy of scarlet may be admitted by recollecting that they had nothing better with which to compare it.' *Pict. Bible*.—¶ *Fine linen*. Heb. שֵׁשׁ *shesh*; denoting the fabric made from the plant of that name which grew in Egypt and Palestine, and which is rendered by the Gr. and Chal. 'Byss,' from the Heb. בּוּץ *butz*. It was either a species of soft, delicate, and downy cotton, or a superior kind of flax, from which garments were made of the most pure and exquisite white. Moses indeed does not employ the term 'Butz' in speaking of linen, which appears in no author prior to the age of the books of Esther and Chronicles, but the words 'Bad' and 'Shesh,' rendered 'Byssos,' *linen*, by the Sept. appear to have been the only ones in use in his day. That which is of most importance in respect to the 'Shesh' or 'Byss,' is the fact here mentioned, that it was the material of which the priestly garments were made which we are told were designed for 'glory and for honor' to the wearers. They were in fact the garments of kings and of nobles. In Gen. 41. 42, we see that Joseph in his exaltation was clothed in one of them, rendered by the Gr. 'stole of byss.' So likewise David appeared in a similar robe on a day of solemnity, 1 Chron. 15. 27. In short, the *byss* garments were the most resplendent and valuable of all the white apparel in use among the Israelites. Our Savior, therefore, in the parable of the rich man describes him as clad 'in purple and *fine linen*, Gr. 'byss.' Again, when the marriage of the Lamb is described in the Apocalypse, ch. 19. 8, it is said of the bride, that 'it was granted to her that she should be arrayed in *fine linen* (byss) clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.' From what we have already said the symbolical import of this will not be of difficult solution. The *byss* being the most valuable species of white garments, constitutes a significant em-

### 5 And rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, and shittim-wood,

blem of the highest and most perfect holiness. The resurrection is the state of perfect holiness; the *byss*, therefore, is the attribute of the saints in a state of resurrection. In like manner we suppose the 'man clothed in linen,' so frequently mentioned by Ezekiel, ch. 9. and 10, to be a symbolical designation of Christ in his post-resurrection state, in which state we know he is for the most part represented as clothed in white raiment.—¶ *Goat's hair.* Heb. עִזִּים *izzim*. That is, the down or finest part of the hair; of which much finer cloth was made in those countries than of the wool of the lamb or the sheep. The hair of the eastern goats, particularly of the Angola species, is of the most delicate and silky softness, and wrought into the kind of cloth known by the name of *camlets*. The word 'hair' does not occur in the Hebrew, but the sense evidently requires its insertion.

5. *Rams' skins dyed red.* Heb. עֹרֹת מֵאֵדָמִים *oroth elim meoddamim*, *skins of red rams*. That is, either those which were naturally of this color, for such are found in the Levant, or those which were made so by dyeing, and thus converted to a kind of *red morocco*.—¶ *Badgers' skins.* Heb. עֹרֹת תְּחָשִׁין *oroth tehashin*. It is very uncertain what is intended by the original word תְּחָשׁ *tahash* here rendered 'badger.' The ancient versions for the most part evidently consider it as designating some kind of color, either purple or violet. But as it appears from Ezek. 16. 10, that it denotes a substance from which shoes were made, it is probably safer to consider it as the appellation of some of the animal tribes whose skins would serve for a rough exterior covering of the Tabernacle to protect the more delicate work of the inner curtains from injury by the weather. Yet that it could not have been

the animal now called 'badger,' there is the strongest reason to believe. The badger is an inhabitant of cold countries, nor can any evidence be adduced that it ever existed in Palestine, Arabia, or Egypt. Whence then could the Israelites have procured its skin to cover the Tabernacle, especially in such quantities as would be requisite? It is by no means a prolific animal, and in the countries in which it breeds, as in England, it is comparatively rare. Moreover, as it is pronounced unclean by the Mosaic law, it would scarcely have been employed for such a sacred purpose. But if it were an animal at all, of what species was it? Aben Ezra thinks, from the force of the term, that it was some animal which was *thick* and *fat*, and 'in this sense the word appears to be the same as the Arabic *dasash*, fat, oily. The conjecture, then, of those who refer the *tahash* to the seal, is every way credible; as in our own island the seal is famous for its fat or oil, which, in default of whale oil, is used for similar purposes. Moreover, seal-skins, on account of their durability, are used to cover trunks and boxes, to defend them from the weather; and as the skin of the *tahash* was used for making shoes, (Ezek. 16. 10.), so the skin of the seal may be, and is, tanned into as good leather as calf-skin itself. It remains, then, to be proved that an animal, fit for the purpose, was readily procurable by the Israelites in the wilderness; for this we quote Thevenot (p. 166.), who, being at Tor, a port on the Red Sea, says, 'But they could not furnish me with any thing of a certain fish, which they call a *sea-man*. However, I got the hand of one since. This fish is taken in the Red Sea, about little isles, that are close by Tor. It is a great, strong fish, and hath nothing extraordinary but two hands, which are indeed like the hands of a man, saving that the fingers are

6 <sup>b</sup> Oil for the light, <sup>c</sup> spices for anointing oil, and for <sup>d</sup> sweet incense.

<sup>b</sup> ch. 27. 20. <sup>c</sup> ch. 30. 23. <sup>d</sup> ch. 30. 34.

joined together with a skin like the foot of a goose; *but the skin of the fish is like the skin of a wild goat, or chamois.* When they spy that fish, they strike him on the back with harping irons, as they do whales, and so kill him. *They use the skin of it for making bucklers, which are musket proof.* Whether this be a species of seal must be left undetermined; as nothing is said of its coming ashore, or being amphibious; nevertheless, it may be the *tahash* of the Hebrews. Niebuhr says (p. 157, Fr. edit.), 'A merchant of Abushahr called *dahash* that fish which the captains of English vessels called *porpoise*, and the Germans *sea-hog*, or *dolphin*. In my voyage from Maskat to Abushahr, I saw a prodigious quantity together, near Ras Mussendom, who all were going the same way, and seemed to swim with great vehemence.' Gesenius adopts the same opinion, on account of the similarity of the Arabic name *dahash*, which means, properly, the dolphin, but is also applied to the seal genus. On many of the small islands of the Red Sea, around the peninsula of Sinai, are found seals; (hence *insula phocarum*, Strab. 16. p. 766.) likewise, a species of sea-cow, called also sea-man or sea-camel, the skin of which is an inch thick, and is used by the Arabs of the present day for shoe-leather. Burckhardt remarks that he 'saw parts of the skin of a large fish, killed on the coast, which was an inch in thickness, and is employed by the Arabs instead of leather for sandals.' *Robinson's Calmet*.—¶ *Shittim-wood*. Heb. עֵץ שִׁטִּים *atzē shittim*, wood of the *shittah* tree, mentioned Is. 41. 19. It is rendered by the Gr. ξύλα ασηπτα, *incorruptible wood*. Though not certainly known, it is supposed, with great probability, to be the acacia, or

7 Onyx-stones, and stones to be set in the <sup>e</sup> ephod, and in the <sup>f</sup> breast-plate.

<sup>e</sup> ch. 28. 4, 6. <sup>f</sup> ch. 28. 15.

species of thorn that still grows in great abundance in the deserts of Arabia; the wood of which, according to Jerome, is extremely light, solid, strong, and smooth; qualities rarely found together in any one wood. The tree is of the size of a large mulberry-tree, large enough, says the father above mentioned, to furnish very long planks. 'The Acacia-tree,' says Dr. Shaw, 'being by much the largest and most common tree in these deserts (Arabia Petrea), we have some reason to conjecture that the *shittim-wood* was the acacia.'

6. *Oil for the light*. For the lamp that was to burn continually in the sanctuary. This it appears, from Ex. 27. 20, was to be 'pure olive oil beaten.'

—¶ *Spices*. Heb. בְּשָׁמִים *besaminim*. Gr. θυμιαματα, *incenses*. The term includes all the odoriferous ingredients which were employed in the composition of the 'anointing oil' or the ointment by which the altar of incense and all the vessels of the ark were hallowed, and lastly, in the incense which was burnt upon the altar.—¶ *For sweet incense*. Heb. לִקְטֹרֶת הַשָּׁמִים *likto-reth hassammim*, for the burning of sweet odors; i. e. upon the golden altar that stood in the holy place. Comp Ex. 30. 22—28.

7. *Onyx stones*. Heb. אֲבִירֵי שָׁהָם *abnē shoham*, stones of *shoham*. See Note on Gen. 2. 12. It is acknowledged that there is great difficulty in ascertaining what stone is meant by the 'shoham.' The Gr. translates the word in different places by no less than six different terms. In the three Chaldee Targums, as also in the Syriac, Arabic, Persic, and Ethiopic versions, it is rendered by 'beryl,' which Ainsworth adopts in his Annotations. As it was one of the jewels in the breastplate, and as two

8 And let them make me a g sanc-

g ch. 36. 1, 3, 4. Lev. 4. 6. & 10. 4. & 21. 12. Hebr. 9. 1, 2.

of them were borne on the High Priest's shoulders, each containing the names of six of the twelve tribes of Israel, it must have been a stone of very considerable size. On this account it is less likely to have been the *onyx* which is a very small stone. There were several kinds of 'beryls,' the most approved of which were of a *sea-green* color, though Pliny describes one as inclining to a hyacinthine or azure color. But of the 'beryl' see Note on Ex. 28. 9, 20. — ¶ *Stones to be set.* Heb. מַלְאִיִּם אֲבִנֵי מִלְּוִיִּם *abnē millu'im*, *stones of fillings*; i. e. stones to be set in, or, as artists say, *enchased* in the cavities of gold of the ephod. For a description of the Ephod and Breastplate, see on Ex. 28. 4, and 15.

8. *Let them make me a sanctuary.* Heb. מִקְדָּשׁ מִקְדָּשׁ *mikdash*, *a holy place*; from קָדַשׁ *kadash*, *to sanctify, to hallow*. The term denotes a *holy habitation* expressly consecrated to the residence of the visible divine majesty in the midst of them. — ¶ *That I may dwell among them.* Heb. וְשָׁכַנְתִּי *veshakanti*, *and I will dwell*. Gr. ὁφθῆσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, *I will be seen among you*. Chal. 'I will make my Glory to dwell in the midst of them.' Arab. 'That I may make my Splendor to inhabit among them.' The import plainly is, that God would dwell among them by the signal manifestations of his glory in the Shekinah, the visible token of his presence. The original word שָׁכַן *shakan*, *to dwell in a tent or tabernacle*, and from the same root comes both שְׂכֵנִי *shekinah*, and the Gr. σκηνή, *a tent or tabernacle*, from which latter is the derivative σκηνη, *a tent or tabernacle*. The radical consonants (*sh*), *s*, *k*, *n*, are the same in both languages, to which the vowels are mere factitious append-

tuary; that <sup>h</sup> I may dwell among them.

<sup>h</sup> ch. 29. 45. 1 Kings 6. 13. 2 Cor. 6. 16. Hebr. 3. 6. Rev. 21. 3.

ages. In express allusion therefore to the mode of the divine residence among the Israelites, it is said of Christ, John 1. 14, 'the Word was made flesh and *dwell* (ἐσκηνώσε *tabernacled* or *shekinized*) among us, and we beheld his *glory*,' i. e. at the transfiguration, when the cloud or vail of his flesh, by being temporarily rent asunder, disclosed the true inner glory of his Godhead, answering to the luminous cloud of the Shekinah, which is in numerous instances called δόξα, *glory*. In like manner, in allusion to the sensible mode in which God manifested himself to his peculiar people. Christ is said to be the 'brightness of the Father's glory,' Heb. 1. 3, language which goes to identify the person of the Son with the glorious apparition of the Shekinah. The term again occurs in evident allusion to these words of Moses, Rev. 21. 3, 'And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the *tabernacle* of God is with men, and he will *dwell with them*.' This is the fulfilment of the prediction uttered by Ezekiel 37. 26, 27, 'And I will set my *sanctuary* in the midst of them for evermore; my *tabernacle* also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people,' announcing a period yet future when this earth shall again be distinguished by some visible manifestation of the divine presence under circumstances of far more glory than those in which he appeared of old to the chosen people, and answering the same purpose in respect to the whole human race which the Shekinah of the Tabernacle did in respect to a single nation. It is the period, as we have elsewhere remarked, of the New Jerusalem, of which the same prophet says, Ezek. 48. 35, 'The name of the city from that day shall be, *The Lord*

9 i According to all that I shew thee, *after* the pattern of the tab-

i ver. 40.

is there (יהוה שמה Yehovah sham-mah). But 'the Lord' (Jehovah) is the Shekinah, and the Shekinah is the Logos and the Lamb who is to be the Light and Glory of the heaven-descended city, and the intimation is clear that this *manifested presence* of the Deity is there to form so prominent and conspicuous an object, that the city itself is to receive from it its characteristic denomination. At the same time it is not to be forgotten that it will be a residence 'among men,' men inhabiting this terraqueous globe; for there is no greater mistake than to interpret the sublime representations of the latter part of the Apocalypse of an extramundane state of glory, having no relation to the present condition of man, or to the original scene of his existence. Time and the Providence of God will doubtless work a great change in the views of believers in reference to the genuine scope of the visions contained in this wonderful book, a portion of revelation which unfortunately has fallen into a disesteem never enough to be deplored.

9. *According to all that I shew.* Heb. *כִּלְכֹּל אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מֵרָאֶה אֵתְּךָ kekol asher ani mareh otheke, according to all that I make thee to see.* We have before remarked, Ex. 24. 10, 11, that we suppose the pattern of the Tabernacle and its furniture, but more especially the Ark, the Cherubim and the Glory, to have been shown to Moses in the presence of Aaron and his sons and the seventy elders, and the phraseology of the present passage does not militate with this idea. The designation of time by the Hebrew verbs and participles is very indefinite, and in this instance the usus loquendi will admit of the showing being understood of the past as well as the present. The whole time of Mo-

se's sojourn on the mount, after leaving the camp with his companions, seems to be spoken of as one continuous term, not requiring to have its periods accurately distinguished. — ¶ *After the pattern of the tabernacle.* Heb. *תְּבַנִּית מִשְׁכָּן tabnith mishkan.* We have in *מִשְׁכָּן mishkan* another derivative from the root *שָׁכַן shakan*, rightly rendered *tabernacle*. The other term *תְּבַנִּית tabnith*, comes from *בָּנָה banah*, to build, and properly signifies in this connexion *a model, a prototype, an exemplar*, implying something *sensible, corporeal*, or *substantial* in contradistinction from *דְּמוּת demuth*, a likeness, which is applied rather in the general sense of *representation, picture, or image*, than of a *framed model* of any kind of structure. The distinction is very clearly indicated in 2 Kings, 16. 10, 'And king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, and saw an altar that was at Damascus: and king Ahaz sent to Urijah the priest the *fashion* (דְּמוּת demuth) of the altar, and the *pattern* (תְּבַנִּית tabnith) of it, according to all the workmanship thereof;' where *תְּבַנִּית tabnith* undoubtedly signifies *a model*, and *דְּמוּת demuth* some other kind of *representation*, either *verbal* or *pictorial*. In like manner we find a striking parallel, not only to the *phrase*, but to the *general fact* here recorded, in the history of the building of the Temple, 1 Chron. 28. 11, 12, 'Then David gave to Solomon his son the *pattern* (תְּבַנִּית tabnith) of the porch, and of the houses thereof, and of the treasures thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the inner parlors thereof, and of the place of the mercy-seat, and the *pattern* (תְּבַנִּית tabnith) of all he had by the Spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and of all the chambers round about, of the treasuries of the house of God, and of the treasu-

ries of the dedicated things.' David, it seems, was furnished by divine inspiration with a *visionary archetype* of the Temple which he would have Solomon build to the Lord, and in accordance with this vision he procured a *pattern* or *model* to be executed, which should answer the purpose of guiding his son in the construction of the sacred edifice. In the present instance, we do not indeed imagine that there was any miniature model in wood or stone of the Tabernacle made by Omnipotence and shown to Moses; but we do suppose that the *supernatural spectacle* presented to his view was so ordered as to convey to his mind all the impression which would have been produced by an actual objective presentation of the scenery to his outward senses in the form of substantial realities. On this strong, clear, and vivid impression of the objects seen, we suppose the use of the term *model* or *pattern* was founded. The vision was to him in the place of a *pattern*.

It may not be inapposite in this connexion to dwell somewhat upon the fact of the remarkable, and we doubt not designed, inter-relation between the general plan of the Tabernacle in its different parts, and the ideas usually entertained among the ancient Hebrews of the structure of the heavens. However it may be accounted for, we think the position is unquestionable, that the Scriptures, in their peculiar phraseology, do recognise a singular correspondence between at least the inner sanctuary, the holy of holies, both in the Tabernacle and Temple, and the supernal regions called *heaven* or *the heavens*, considered especially as the residence of God, where he sat upon the throne of his glory, surrounded by the angelic hosts. Indeed Gussetius, an eminent Hebrew Lexicographer, contends that all the 'pattern' shown to Moses on this occasion was the *heavens themselves*. This is perhaps too vague

an explanation to meet the demands of a rigid exegesis, but that there was a remarkable symbolical affinity, running occasionally into absolute identity, in the ideas of *heaven* and the *holy of holies*, may doubtless be shown beyond dispute. Such a fact, if it can be made to appear, will be of great importance in giving distinctness to our conceptions of the mystic scenery of the Apocalypse, which may be said to be almost entirely made up of elements furnished by the Tabernacle and Temple ritual. It will also go far to account for the allegorising expositions of Josephus and Philo, who evidently confounded the *symbolical* with the *philosophical* import of these sacred ordinances. Of these writers, the latter says expressly when speaking of the Tabernacle, that 'as for the inside, Moses parted its length into three partitions. At the distance of ten cubits from the most secret end, he placed four pillars, each a small matter distant from his fellow. Now the room within these pillars was The Most Holy Place; but the rest of the room was the Tabernacle, which was open for the priests. However this proportion of the measures of the Tabernacle proved to be *an imitation of the system of the world*; for that third part thereof which was within the four pillars, to which the (common) priests were not admitted, *is, as it were, an heaven peculiar to God*; but the space of the twenty cubits, *is, as it were, sea and land, on which men live, and so this part is peculiar to the priests only*.' Again, in accordance with this idea, he says of the Candlestick, that 'it terminated in seven heads, in one row, all standing parallel to one another; and these branches carried seven lamps, one by one, *in imitation of the number of the planets*.' In another passage, where he feels himself called upon to vindicate the wisdom of the Mosaic institutions, he remarks, 'Now here one may wonder at the ill-will which men bear

to us, and which they profess to be on account of our despising that deity which they pretend to honor; for if any one do but consider the fabric of the Tabernacle, and take a view of the garments of the high priest, and of those vessels which we make use of in our sacred ministration, he will find that our legislator was a divine man, and that we are unjustly reproached by others; for if any one do without prejudice, and with judgment look upon these things, he will find *they were every one made in way of imitation and representation of the universe*. When Moses distinguished the Tabernacle into three parts, and allowed two of them to the priests, as a place accessible and common, he denoted the land and the sea, they being of general access to all; *but he set apart the third division for God, because heaven is inaccessible to men.*

In what manner these astronomical ideas became grafted upon the peculiar fabric we are now considering, would no doubt be a difficult problem to solve, were it not for the clue afforded us in the scriptural diction which we are now about to lay before the reader. From this it will appear that it originated in a perversion or distortion of the dim intimations which were then enjoyed of the true symbolical import of these sacred institutions. And no doubt a large portion of the ancient mythological fictions could be traced by a rigid inquiry to the same source. *They are the distorted relics of an early revelation abounding in types and symbols.*

We have said that our present enquiry derives importance from its furnishing a key to the mystic scenery of the Apocalypse. Let us then take our starting point from this wonderful book, and if we should be led into somewhat of an extended array of the prophetic *usus loquendi*, we may still hope to find the result richly rewarding the time and toil of the investigation.

Probably few readers of the Revelation have failed to be struck with the fact, that while the scene of the vision is apparently laid *in heaven* (rather '*the heaven*'—*ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*), yet the presence of many of the appurtenances of the Tabernacle or Temple is constantly recognised. Thus in ch. 4. 1, 2, John says, 'After this I looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven—and immediately I was in the Spirit; and behold a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne.' Now as he goes on to describe a 'sea of glass' answerable to the 'brazen sea' which stood before the sanctuary; the 'four living creatures' identical with the 'cherubims' that spread their wings over the mercy-seat; and 'seven lamps of fire burning before the throne,' corresponding with the seven lamps of the candlestick placed before the vail in the holy place; how can we resist the conclusion that the 'heaven' of which he speaks is really nothing else than the *holy of holies*, and that the *throne* is the mercy-seat on which the Shekinah, the visible Glory, rested? This is confirmed by the annexed circumstance of seeing a *door*, or rather a *door-way*, an *entrance* (*θύρα*), which had been previously opened (*ἀνεῳγμένη*), and through which he was enabled to see the throne and its occupant. Now where a door-way is mentioned, the idea of an apartment or apartments naturally suggests itself to the mind, and if John saw the *throne* through the *opened entrance*, he must have been in one apartment, and the throne in another, as otherwise it is impossible to discover a reason for the mention of the door-way at all in this connexion. All this accords perfectly with the local arrangements of the Tabernacle and Temple, which consisted of two apartments, commonly separated by the vail of partition. In the outer apartment, or holy place, stood the seven-branched candlestick, and throughout the three first chapters the

scene of John's vision is confined altogether to this first or outer room, where he beholds Christ in his priestly dress engaged about the lights of the lamp, which in the language of symbols are said to be seven stars that he holds in his right hand. Up to this time John had not seen the mercy-seat; the veil therefore was then in its place, and the *θύρα* or *entrance-way* was closed. But now a fresh illapse of the Spirit comes upon him, the veil is removed, and his entranced eye looks into the inner hallowed shrine of the sanctuary.

If then the scene of this vision was the *earthly sanctuary*, and not *heaven above*, as has been generally imagined, why does he call it 'the heaven?' To this we answer, because it is so called in the Old Testament, and because it was intended as a type or adumbration of the true heaven, the place of final happiness and glory of the saints. As this is a fact of some importance and one that goes to correct the interpretation of many passages in which the word 'heaven' occurs, a strict examination of the Old Testament usage in regard to this word will be necessary. And first it is clear that the *mercy-seat* is called God's *seat*; and the *sanctuary* which contained the mercy-seat God's *dwelling* or *sitting-place*. Respecting this *seat* or *throne*, God says to Moses, Ex. 25. 22, 'There will I meet with thee, and *commune* (*דברתי dibbarti*) with thee from above the mercy-seat, and from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony,' &c. The place of the mercy-seat being intended for oral communication, it receives a name answerable to this in 1 Kings, 6 and 8, and in 2 Chron. 5, where it is called *דביר debir*, *word-place*, *speaking-place*, *oracle*, which term in 1 Kings, 8. 6, is plainly put in apposition with *קדש הקדשים kodesh hakkodoshim*, the *holy of holies*, the name given to the inner apartment of the sanctuary; 'And the priests brought

in the ark of the covenant of the Lord unto his place, into the *oracle* (*דביר*) of the house, to the *most holy place* (*קדש הקדשים*) even under the wings of the cherubims.' In the dedication of the temple by Solomon the phraseology in different passages is to be especially noticed. Thus in 1 Kings, 8. 13, he says, 'I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a *settled place* (*מכון mekon*, lit. a *prepared place*) for thee to abide in for ever.' Here it is to be observed that Solomon calls the *house* which he had built the *מכון mekon* or *prepared place*, putting these terms in apposition; and consequently leaving us to infer that whatever other terms may in the context be found put in apposition with either of these, they are to have a similar application. With this remark premised let the phraseology in the sequel of the chapter be observed. In v. 30, it is said, 'Hearken thou to the supplication of thy servants, and of thy people Israel, when they shall pray toward this place: and hear thou *in heaven thy dwelling-place*: *אל מקום אל השמים el mekom shibteka el hash-shamayim*, *in thy sitting-place, or dwelling-place, even in the heaven*): and when thou hearest forgive.' With this compare v. 39, 'Then hear thou *in heaven thy dwelling-place* (*מכון שבתי mekon shibteka*, the *prepared place of thy sitting, or dwelling*), and forgive,' &c. Here there is a change of terms in the original which is lost sight of in our version, but which is quite important in making out the point before us. In the one case we have *מקום שבתי mekom shibteka*, the *place of thy dwelling*; in the other *מכון שבתי mekon shibteka*, the *prepared place of thy dwelling*. But it is clear from the comparison thus made in the Hebrew text, that the terms 'heaven,' 'house,' and 'prepared place' are used as equivalents. But Solomon says, v. 13, that he had built the *מכון mekon* or *prepared place*; consequently he had built the *heaven* in which God is



here said to dwell. It is true indeed that in other texts in this chapter 'heaven' is clearly employed in the sense of the upper regions of ether, or the celestial firmament, as it is ordinarily understood. Thus v. 23, 'And he said, Lord God of Israel, there is no God like thee *in heaven above*, or on earth beneath.' So also v. 27, 'But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold the *heaven and heaven of heavens* cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded?' But while this is admitted, it is impossible to resist the evidence that *prepared place* and *heaven* are synonymous terms in this connexion, and consequently that *the heaven* was a place which Solomon had built for the residence of the Most High by his appropriate symbol. In thinking of 'the heaven' of which Solomon here speaks we are to bring before our minds the imagery connected with the *holy of holies*, viz., the ark of the covenant, the mercy-seat or throne, the overshadowing cherubims, and the luminous cloud of the Shekinah.

This view will be confirmed by the parallel recital in 2 Chron. chps. 6 and 7, particularly 7. 1, 2, where a circumstance of great importance is noticed, which is not stated in the book of Kings; 'Now when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down *from heaven* (מֵהַשָּׁמַיִם *mēhash-shamayim*, *from the heaven*), and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices; and the glory of the Lord filled the house. And the priests could not enter into the house of the Lord, because the glory of the Lord had filled the Lord's house.' The answer thus given to the prayer of Solomon in the presence of all the worshippers, gave evidence that God had accepted *the house, the sanctuary, the heaven, the place prepared for his sitting*; for the fire here spoken of descended undoubtedly not from *heaven above*, but from the cloud which covered the mercy-seat

in the holy of holies. It is to be observed that the cloud had filled not only the inner apartment in which the priests had placed the mercy-seat, but the holy place or outer apartment, in which the priests usually officiated, so that the priests could no longer continue there (1 Kings, 8. 10). 'All were in the court without, in that part where the altar stood, before the sanctuary; and when Solomon had ended his prayer, fire came forth from the sanctuary, from which the priests had been expelled by the luminous cloud, *the prepared place of God's sitting, the heaven*, and fell upon and consumed the sacrifice. This is to be presumed from the analogous circumstance mentioned Lev. 9. 23, 24, 'And Moses and Aaron went into the Tabernacle of the congregation, and came out and blessed the people; and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. *And there came a fire out from before the Lord*, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted and fell on their faces.' By this is doubtless meant that the fire came out from the presence of the Shekinah, which had now taken its station in the holy of holies, though the glorious effulgence had spread itself on this occasion over all the Tabernacle and appeared in the view of the whole congregation. Consider moreover the coincidence of the circumstances stated respecting *this heaven, the place prepared by Solomon* for the God of Israel to dwell in, and those stated by John respecting *the heaven* he describes. In Solomon's heaven there was a *seat* or *throne* (the mercy-seat); so there is in John's. Solomon's heaven was a *speaking-place* or *oracle*, and from Solomon's heaven came *fire* to consume the sacrifice; so also from the throne described by John proceeded *voices and lightnings*, Rev. 4. 5; and the seat in each is occupied by One to whom divine honors are paid.

The foregoing are not the only passages which serve to prove that 'the heaven' in which John saw the *opened entrance* and the *throne*, was the *earthly sanctuary*. In proportion as the relation which subsists between the different things mentioned in the Apocalypse is discovered, our knowledge of the particulars will be extended. At present we will simply advert to a single passage which will receive a striking light from the exposition given above. In Rev. 13. 1—10, we have the description of a symbolical beast identical with the fourth beast of Daniel, which is all but universally admitted to shadow forth the persecuting power of the Roman empire. Among the other disastrous doings of this baneful monster, it is said, v. 6, that 'he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his *Tabernacle*, and them that dwell in heaven.' That is, to blaspheme, reproach, vilify, lord it over, and persecute the true worshippers of God, represented by the Cherubims that were placed over the Ark of the Covenant, in the *holy of holies*. So that in blaspheming the *tabernacle*, he blasphemed those that dwelt in it, or in other words, those that *dwell in heaven*.'

On the whole, we cannot question but that this idea of the import of the term 'heaven' is important to a right view of that blessed expectancy which, under the same name, sustains and fires the hope of the Christian in his toilsome pilgrimage through this vale of tears. If we conceive the subject aright, *the heavenly state is the substance of the mystery of the Most Holy Place of the Tabernacle and Temple*. This mystery is explained in the closing chapters of the Apocalypse, which affords us the only adequate clue to the prophetic purport of the *Tabernacle-structure*. There indeed the *inner oracle* is expanded into a glorious city, but it is enriched with the possession of the same celestial sanctities,

unfolded into their full dimensions, and shining forth in a splendor suited to their divine nature. The link of connexion between the type and the anti-type, the shadow and the substance, we doubt not, is clearly disclosed in the following passages; 'And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, *having the glory of God*: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper-stone, clear as crystal; and the city lieth four-square, and the length is as large as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length, and the breadth, and the height of it are equal.' Here we recognise in the 'Glory of God' the Shekinah of the ancient economy, and in the four-square form of the city the substantiated verity of the *holy of holies* of the Tabernacle and the Temple, in each of which this apartment was a *perfect cube*. Again it is said, 'And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.' By the 'temple' here is to be understood the *pronaos*, or *anterior structure*, which contained the outer room, as contradistinguished from the *sanctum sanctorum*, which in this ulterior economy of glory has absorbed within itself the distinguishing features of every previous, imperfect and shadowy dispensation, and become *the all in all*. 'And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever.' This is language evidently borrowed from Isaiah in speaking, chap. 19. 20, of the same halcyon period; 'The sun shall be no more thy light by day: neither for brightness

shall the moon give light unto thee : but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down ; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself : for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended.' It contains another, and still more emphatic, recognition of that *Resplendent Presence* which under the title of *Jehovah, Angel of Jehovah, Shekinah, Glory of the Lord, &c.*, pointed forward to Christ in his risen and glorified *theanthropy*, when he should be revealed, as he is here, as the Luminary of the New Jerusalem, superseding the sun, and throwing all created glory into eclipse. In the idea of this transcendent illumination we may safely include all the *moral* elements, which in the pious mind naturally connect themselves with the manifested presence of the *God of Truth*, and at the same time admit the sense of the *visible personal display* which seems to be called for by the explicitness of the letter. Still we are reminded that the scene, however magnificent and beautiful, is sublunary. Whatever physical changes of a renovating nature may take place upon the surface of the globe, or in its relation to the planetary system, the locality of this state of 'accomplished bliss' will be upon the earth which we now inhabit, at least for the period to which the Scriptures carry forward the heirs of life in their revelations of eternal destiny. What new phases of felicity may come over their lot in the boundless tract of time and space into which their existence is launched, revolving ages can alone determine. But the disclosures of revelation still retain us within the precincts of the inhabited earth. 'And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it ; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it.' This is strikingly paralleled by the kindred prediction of

Isaiah, ch. 60. 2, 3—11, 'The Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles (nations) shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually ; they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces (wealth) of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought.' All this supposes a scene still earthly.

A few more extracts pointing out the identity of the heavenly city with the *substance* of the *most holy place* of the Tabernacle, and we bid a reluctant adieu to the inspiring theme. 'And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. And there shall be no more curse ; but the throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it ; and his servants shall serve him : and they shall see his face ; and his name shall be in their foreheads.' These servants are the cherubic legions, whose appropriate device in the sanctuary looked from the extremities of the mercy-seat directly upon the bright cloud of the Presence, now developed into myriads of happy human existences, rejoicing before the throne, and making their perpetual oblations of service and praise. In view of this blissful inheritance, who does not feel involuntarily prompted to exclaim with the prophet, 'Glory to the righteous !' And who but must be profoundly impressed with the ineffable misery of those who shall finally come short of this 'exceeding and eternal weight of glory?' May then the solemn concluding intimation of the Apocalypse sink into the deepest recesses of the souls both of the writer and his readers ; 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and

10 ¶ *k* And they shall make an ark of shittim-wood: two cubits and a half *shall be* the length there-

*k* ch. 37. 1. Deut. 10. 3. Hebr. 9. 4.

maketh a lie. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning-star. And the Spirit and the bride say come. And let him that hear-eth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.'

#### THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

10. *They shall make an ark of Shittim-wood.* Heb. אֲרוֹן *aron*. From the identity of rendering, it might be thought that the ark of the Tabernacle and that of Noah were expressed by the same term in Hebrew. But such is not the case. The former is called אֲרוֹן *aron*, and the latter תֵּבָה *tebah*; but the Greek having rendered both terms by κιβωτος, this has been followed by our own and many other versions. The object itself was properly a *chest* or *coffer* of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold, in which was deposited the tables of the ten commandments, together with Aaron's rod that budded, and the golden pot of preserved manna. This chest seems to have been of the dimensions of three feet nine inches in length, by two feet three inches in breadth and depth, according to the common cubit of eighteen inches. Around the upper edge was a rim or cornice—called in the text 'a crown'—of pure gold; and on each side were fixed rings of gold to receive the poles of shittim-wood covered with gold, by which the ark was carried from place to place. The staves always remained in the rings, even when the ark was at rest. The ark had at top a lid or cover of solid gold; for such was what the text calls 'the mercy-seat,' and which the Septuagint renders ἱλαστήριον or the *propitiatory*, by which name it is men-


tioned by St. Paul in Heb. 9. 4, and which was probably so called, because, on the great day of atonement, the blood of the expiatory sacrifice was sprinkled on or before it. Upon the two ends of this lid, and of the same matter with it, that is, solid gold, were placed two figures of cherubim which looked towards each other, and whose outstretched wings, meeting over the centre of the ark, overshadowed it completely. It was here that the Shekinah or Divine Presence more immediately rested, and both in the Tabernacle and Temple was indicated by a cloud, from the midst of which responses were delivered in an audible voice whenever the Lord was consulted in behalf of the people. Hence God is sometimes mentioned as he that 'dwelleth' or 'sitteth between the cherubim.' In its removals the ark was covered with a vail, Num. 4. 6, and might only be carried on the shoulders of the priests or Levites. The Rabbins think, with some reason, that it was only carried by the priests on extraordinary occasions, being ordinarily borne by the Levites. No other form of conveyance was allowed, nor were any other persons permitted to interfere with it. The fate of Uzzah, 2 Sam. 6. 3, admonished the Israelites, in a very solemn manner, of the consequences of even a well meant officiousness in a matter where the divine will had been so clearly expressed to the contrary.

After the Israelites had passed the Jordan, the ark generally occupied its proper place in the Tabernacle, and was afterwards placed in the Temple built by Solomon. From the direction given by Josiah to the Levites, 2 Chron. 35. 3, to restore the ark to its place, it would seem to have been previously removed, but it is not known whether this was

done by the priests, to preserve it from profanation, or by the idolatrous kings Manasseh or Amon, to make room for their idols. It seems that the ark, with the other precious things of the Temple, became the spoil of Nebuchadnezzar, and was taken to Babylon; and it does not appear that it was restored at the end of the captivity, or that any new one was made. What became of the ark after the captivity cannot be ascertained. Some of the Rabbins think that it was concealed, to preserve it from the Chaldeans, and that it could not again be discovered, nor will be till the Messiah comes and reveals it. Others say that it was indeed taken away by the Chaldeans, but was afterwards restored, and occupied its place in the second Temple: but the Talmud and some of the Jewish writers confess, that the want of the ark was one of the points in which the second Temple was inferior to that of Solomon: to which we may add that neither Ezra, Nehe-

miah, the Maccabees, nor Josephus, mention the ark as extant in the second Temple, and the last authority expressly says that there was nothing in the sanctuary when the Temple was taken by Titus. It certainly does not appear in the Arch erected at Rome in honor of that conqueror, and in which the spoils of the Temple are displayed; although some writers have attempted to identify it with the table of shewbread which is there represented.

It is to be remarked that similar arks or chests, containing the mysteries of their religions, were common among nearly all the ancient heathen nations, the hint of which was probably taken from that of the Jews. The Egyptians, for instance, carried in solemn processions a sacred chest, containing their secret things and the mysteries of their religion, of which the following cut, from the hieroglyphic remains of that country, shows a very remarkable conformity to the Hebrew model.



EGYPTIAN ARK BORNE BY PRIESTS.

The Trojans also had their sacred chest; and the *palladium* of the Greeks and Romans was something not very unlike. It is remarkable too, that as the Hebrew Tabernacle and Temple had a

holy of holies, in which the ark was deposited, so had the heathen, in the inmost part of their temples, an *adytum* or *penetrale*, which none but the priests might enter. Something very similar

11 And thou shalt overlay it with pure gold, within and without shalt thou overlay it; and shalt make upon it a crown of gold round about.

12 And thou shalt cast four rings of gold for it, and put *them* in the four corners thereof; and two rings *shall be* in the one side of it, and two rings in the other side of it.

13 And thou shalt make staves of shittim-wood, and overlay them with gold.

may also be traced among barbarous and savage nations. Thus, Tacitus, speaking of the nations of Northern Germany, of whom our Saxon ancestors were a branch, says that they generally worshipped Hertham, or the Mother Earth (*Terram matrem*); believing her to interpose in the affairs of men, and to visit nations; and that to her, within a grove in a certain island, was consecrated *a vehicle covered with a vestment*, and which none but the priests were allowed to touch. The same thing has been frequently noticed in connexion with the religious systems of other heathen nations, and among the inhabitants of Mexico and the South Sea Islands, very curious analogies with the Mosaic ark have been discovered, of which the reader will find an account in Parkhurst's Heb. Lex. Art. כָּרָן.

11. *Make upon it a crown of gold round about.* Heb. זָרָה סָבִיב *zër zahab sabib*, a golden border round about. Gr. κυματια χρυσα στρεπτα, *golden wreathed waves round about.* This 'crown' was an ornamental cornice, moulding, or border, which went round the top, as a kind of enclosure serving to make firm the propitiatory in its place, and called a 'crown' from its encompassing the whole outer extremities of the upper side of the ark somewhat as a crown encircles the temples of the head. The term is only employed in reference to the *rims* or *crowns* of gold made round the ark of the covenant,

14 And thou shalt put the staves into the rings by the sides of the ark, that the ark may be borne with them.

15 <sup>1</sup>The staves shall be in the rings of the ark: they shall not be taken from it.

16 And thou shalt put into the ark <sup>m</sup>the testimony which I shall give thee.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings 8. 8. <sup>m</sup> ch. 16. 34. & 31. 18. Deut. 10. 2, 5. & 31. 26. 1 Kings 8. 9. 2 Kings 11. 12. Hebr. 9. 4.

the table of shew-bread, and the altar of incense. From the rendering of the Greek it would appear that the work of this cornice was somehow exquisitely wrought in graceful flexures or undulations, resembling the waves of the sea.

12. *Thou shalt cast four rings of gold, &c.* Doubtless of solid gold, as they were to sustain a very considerable weight when the staves were inserted and the ark borne by the priests. Whether these rings were placed lengthwise or breadthwise of the ark is not clear. We infer the latter, however, as otherwise, when carried, the front part of the ark with its cherubim would be sideways, which is not likely. Besides we are told, 1 Kings, 8. 8, that in the Temple 'the ends of the staves were seen out in the holy place, before the oracle;' consequently, as the ark fronted the entrance, the staves must have run along the extremity of its breadth, instead of its length.

16. *Thou shalt put — the testimony, &c.* That is, the two tables of stone on which the Law of the ten Commandments was written; called 'the testimony,' because God did in them *testify* his authority over the Israelites, his regard for them, his presence with them, and his displeasure against them in case they transgressed; while they on the other hand by accepting and depositing this Law in its appointed place, *testified* their professed subjection and obedience to its requirements.—On the

17 And <sup>n</sup> thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold : two cubits and a half *shall be* the length thereof,

<sup>n</sup> ch. 37. 6. Rom. 3. 25. Hebr. 9. 5.

difficulty supposed to be created by the comparison of this passage with Heb. 9. 4, see the commentators on that text, particularly the XVIIth Excursus in Prof. Stuart's Commentary on Hebrews.

17. *Thou shalt make a mercy-seat of pure gold.* Heb. כַּפֹּרֶת *kapporeth*, from כָּפַר *kaphar*, to cover. The verb is, however, used for the most part in a moral sense, being applied to the covering, that is, the expiation, of sins. The Gr. version unites the two senses by rendering ἱλαστήριον ἐπιθεμα, that is, a propitiatory covering, or mercy-seat, a rendering sanctioned by the Holy Spirit, as we find it employed, with the omission of the last word, by the apostle, Heb. 9. 5, 'And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat (ἱλαστήριον).' The same term in Rom. 3. 25, is applied to Christ, 'whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (ἱλαστήριον) through faith in his blood.' So also 1 John, 2. 2, 'He is the propitiation (ἱλαστήριον) for our sins.' From whence the conclusion is probably fairly to be drawn, that this mercy-seat was in some sense an adumbration of Christ as the grand medium of expiation for the sins of men. This mercy-seat, which was made of solid gold instead of wood overlaid with gold, like the rest of the ark, was the upper side of the sacred chest made to be removed entirely, or, as Josephus says, raised by hinges, when the tables of testimony were to be taken out or put in.

#### THE CHERUBIM.

18. *Thou shalt make two cherubims of gold, &c.* Heb. כְּרֻבִים *kerubim*. Gr. χερουβιμ *Cheroubim*. Our English word is the plural untranslated of the original כְּרֻב *kerub*, a term of which the etymology is very much of a contested

and a cubit and a half the breadth thereof.

18 And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold, of beaten work

point with critics and lexicographers. According to the regular analogy of the language, it has the form of the past participle of the verb כָּרַב *karab*. But no such verb exists among the living roots of the Hebrew. It was therefore regarded by most of the ancient Christian fathers as a compound word made up perhaps of נָכַר *nakar*, to know, and רֹב *rub*, multitude, equivalent to *multitudo scientiæ* or *multitudo cognitionis*, abundance of knowledge; or of כֵּן *ke*, רֹב *rub*, and בִּינָה *binah*, quasi *multitudo cognitionis*, of equivalent import. But this mode of derivation is so utterly at variance with the laws which regulate the process of formation in Hebrew words, that it cannot be sustained for a moment when tried by the test of sound criticism. Yet it is remarkable that in nearly all the ancient interpretations the idea of *multitude* was prominent, indicating that they regarded רֹב *rub* *multitudo* as beyond doubt one of its constituent elements. We have no doubt they were correct in assigning this as one of the meanings of the symbol, but they were unquestionably wrong in eliciting this idea from the etymology of the term. At the same time, although the genius of the language will not admit the legitimate development of the sense of *knowledge* or *intelligence* from any part of the word, yet it is very possible to account for this sense being deduced from it by the philosophizing fathers of the church; for with the Platonists wings were deemed an emblem of *wisdom* and *knowledge*, and the same import was thought to be conveyed by the Cherubim being 'full of eyes before and behind.' Taking therefore this apprehended import of the symbol itself, and applying it reflexly to the structure of the term, they gave

as the result the interpretation above-mentioned, which is no unfair specimen of patristic philology. Others again with more regard to intrinsic probability have proposed, by a transposition of letters, to trace the word to the root **רכב** *rakab*, to *ride*, as the Cherubim are described in the remarkable vision of Ezekiel, ch. 1, as forming, together with the mystic animated wheels, a kind of *living chariot* on which the symbol of the divine glory is exhibited as upborne and transported; whence the Psalmist, Ps. 18. 10, describes the Most High as 'riding upon the Cherub;' and the Cherubim in Solomon's temple, 1 Chron. 28. 18, are called 'a chariot.'

By others various other etymologies have been suggested, but none entirely satisfactory. After a pretty extensive and elaborate investigation we have on the whole been inclined to give the preference to the root above-mentioned, viz., **כרב** *karab*, now obsolete in Hebrew, but existing in Syriac and Arabic in the primitive sense of *ploughing* or *making furrows in the earth*; and thence, secondly, of *making incisions in metals*, or *engraving*, and finally by natural transition, of *making sculptured figures*, or *glyphs*, of any kind. This is confirmed by Rosenmüller, who remarks that as one and the same word in Syriac and Arabic is used to denote *expressing*, *sculpturing*, and *fabricating*, so in the verb **כרב** *karab* and its derivatives the same complex idea is involved, as is to be inferred from the fact that the Syriac *korubo* signifies not only a *ploughman*, but also a *former of images*. It may also be observed that as *b*, *v*, and *f* are in all languages permutable, being letters of the same organ, this etymology presents us with some remarkable affinities. For beginning with the Heb. **כרב** *karab*, to *make incisions*, we find in the Teutonic family for *incidere*, to *cut* as in engraving. Germ. *kerben*, Angl. Sax. *keorfan*, Eng. *carve*; and then as *g* and *k* are inter-


changeable, we have the Gr. *γραφο*, *grapho*, Germ. *graben*, Angl. Sax. *grafan*, Eng. *grave*, *engrave*, and Fr. *griffon* (*griffin*), an imaginary animal compounded of beast and bird, evidently derived from a distortion of the cherubic figure. In all these words the idea of *sculpturing* or *engraving* is predominant, and according to the analogy of Hebrew formations **כרוב** *kerub* would properly signify that which was *carved*, *sculptured*, or *wrought with a graving tool*, thus corresponding very well with what is said of the Cherubim as a kind of *statuary* or wrought images placed over the mercy-seat.

In the annexed cut it may be thought that we have but loosely followed the example of Moses in 'making every thing after the pattern shown in the mount,' inasmuch as Moses says nothing of the fourfold variety of faces which we have here given to the Cherubic emblem. But our design is taken from the Cherubim of Ezekiel, which are thus described, ch. 1. 4—14. 'And I looked, and behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire unfolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the color of amber, out of the midst of the fire. Also out of the midst thereof came the likeness of four living creatures. And this was their appearance; they had the likeness of a man. And every one had four faces, and every one had four wings. And their feet were straight feet; and the sole of their feet was like the sole of a calf's foot; and they sparkled like the color of burnished brass. And they had the hands of a man under their wings on their four sides; and they four had their faces and their wings. Their wings were joined one to another; they turned not when they went; they went every one straight forward. As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side: and they four had the face of an ox on



the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle. Thus were their faces: and their wings were stretched upward; two wings of every one were joined one to another, and two covered their bodies, And they went every one straight forward; whither the spirit was to go, they went; and they turned not when they went. As for the likeness of the living creatures, their appearance was like burning coals of fire, and like the

appearance of lamps: it went up and down among the living creatures; and the fire was bright, and out of the fire went forth lightning. And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning.' That these visionary beings, though here called 'living creatures,' were in fact symbolically identical with the 'cherubim,' (erroneously written 'cherubims' in our version), will appear in the sequel.



ARK OF THE COVENANT AND THE CHERUBIM.

The inquiry now arises respecting the *symbolical design* of these very remarkable creations, which, from being mere lifeless sculptured statues in the Mosaic Tabernacle, became animated, intelligent, and active agents in the mystic visions of the prophets. It is certainly one of the lowest aims of infinite wisdom in any part of its dispensations to adopt a system of symbols which should merely address themselves in beautiful or singular forms to the senses, or to the imagination. They approve themselves worthy of the di-

vine source in which they originate only as they disclose a rich and instructive significancy under their outward aspect. That such is preeminently the case with the symbol before us, we shall hope to make appear in the remarks that follow, in the outset of which it will be necessary to show the identity of the Cherubim of Moses with the Living Creatures of Ezekiel. In order to this it is to be observed, that Ezekiel was in captivity in Babylon when this vision was vouchsafed him. But it appears from Ezek. S. 1—3 that

while there he was transported in spirit to Jerusalem, and set down in the precincts of the Temple, where he beheld, among other objects, the Living Creatures and the Throne, previously described, standing in the inner court. 'Then,' says he, ch. 10. 18—22, 'the glory of the Lord (the Shekinah) departed from off the threshold of the house, and stood over the cherubims. And the cherubims lifted up their wings, and mounted up from the earth in my sight: when they went out, the wheels also were beside them, and every one stood at the door of the east gate of the Lord's house; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above. This is the living creature (i. e. collection of living creatures) that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar; and I knew that they were the cherubims. Every one had four faces apiece, and every one four wings; and the likeness of the hands of a man was under their wings. And the likeness of their faces was the same faces which I saw by the river of Chebar, their appearances and themselves: they went every one straight forward.' The import unquestionably is, that although the fact was not at first made known, or the idea did not occur, to him, yet now upon farther pondering the subject, he became fully convinced and assured in his own mind that these Living Creatures were beings of the same symbolical purport with the Cherubim that stood on the Mercy-seat of the Ark in the Temple. This is an important step in the progress of our elucidation. It authorises us to set it down as a point fixed and settled beyond all debate, that *the Cherubim and the Living Creatures are, in symbolical significancy, one and the same.*

We are now prepared to consider the very remarkable usage of the sacred writers in regard both to the Hebrew and Greek original of the term rendered *living creatures* (Heb. חַיִּיִּם *hayoth.*

Gr. ζῶα *zoa*), in each of which languages the respective roots of the words signify *to live*. Yet who would have thought *a priori* that these would have been the terms employed in the following passages? Ps. 68. 9, 10, 'Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance when it was weary. *Thy congregation* (חַיִּיִּם *hayatheka, thy living creature.* Gr. τὰ ζῶα σου, *thy living creatures*) hath dwelt therein.' On what grounds, philologically, this usage is to be explained, we know not, but it is clear that it involves the idea of *multitude*, if the English equivalent, *congregation*, can be any evidence of the fact. A striking parallel occurs, 2 Sam. 23. 11, 'And the Philistines were gathered together *into a troop* (חַיִּיִּם *lahayah, into a living creature.* Gr. εἰς θηρίον, *into a wild beast*), where was a piece of ground full of lentiles: and the people fled from the Philistines.' See also, v. 13, 'And *the troop* (חַיִּיִּם *hayah, the living creature*) of the Philistines pitched in the valley of Rephaim.' The Gr. rendering in the latter passage does not conform, being ταγμα, *a rank, order*, and in military phrase *a battalion, a body of soldiery*. But it is clear from these citations viewed together, that the import of *numbers* actually enters into the usage of the original word for *living creature*, and as the *living creatures* and the *cherubim* are symbolically the same, the idea of *multitude* is equally common to both. This idea, however, it is to be recollected, arises wholly from the interpretation, and not from the etymology of the terms.

As then the four ζῶα, *the living creatures*, of Ezekiel are identical with the *cherubim*, so they are plainly identical also with the four *beasts* (ζῶα) which figure so conspicuously in the mystic machinery of the Apocalypse. Passing from the visions of the river of Chebar to those of the Isle of Patmos, we behold the following scene depicted upon

the prophetic canvass, Rev. 4. 6—8, 'And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal: and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, *were four beasts*, full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast was like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.' As the Cherubim in this vision are nearer to the Throne and the incumbent Majesty than in the other, they are represented as having *six* wings instead of *four*, to denote the propriety of having their persons more fully veiled from the glance of that holy eye to which even the heavens are unclean. But what is the song sung by these emblematic agents? Ch. 5. 8—10, 'And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.' Can the reader have failed, from these ample quotations, to anticipate the conclusion of the whole matter? *The Cherubim of the Tabernacle and Temple, the Living Creatures of Ezekiel, and the hymning beasts of John, are all one and the same symbol.* And what is the *truth* and *mystery* of this symbol? What do we recognise in it but *human* instead of *angelic beings*, even a *multitude of the redeemed from among men*? What else is the burden

of that grateful anthem which resounds from their lips? 'Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' Can this possibly be the language of angels?—especially when we hear the apostle saying, Heb. 2. 16, 'For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham,' and when, moreover, we find in this very context the angels expressly distinguished from the four beasts.

Conceiving this then as a point clearly ascertained, that the Cherubim of the Apocalypse adumbrate a *human* and not an *angelic* order of beings, let us go back and apply this result to the Cherubim of the Pentateuch. We behold them stationed on the Propitiatory, with the symbol of the Divine Presence resting between them, somewhat like Moses on the mount with Aaron and Hur supporting his arms on either side. In this position, as we have seen that they strictly represent *men* and not *angels*, what more natural than that their primary and proximate drift as symbols should be *to shadow forth the race of Israel and the great fact of God's peculiar residence among them*? In the cherubic emblems of the Tabernacle, therefore, we behold a mystic embodiment of the congregation which, in the wilderness, was ordinarily encamped round about the holy fabric without. Accordingly the high priest who entered into the *holy of holies* and there looked upon the Ark of the Covenant and its cherubic appendages, with the Shekinah enthroned between, beheld in fact but a miniature model of what he saw on a large scale when standing in the midst of the many thousands of Israel abiding in their tents. There were the Cherubim resolved into their constituent multitudes, and over the host rested in calm majesty the Pillar of Cloud, the visible token of the Divinity permanently residing among the chosen

tribes. But even this was a *typical* scene, presenting to the eye an image of that state which shall be disclosed when the last chapters of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John shall be fulfilled, when the Tabernacle of God shall again be with men, and he shall set his sanctuary in the midst of them for ever more.

Whether Moses or Ezekiel or John were themselves aware of the true import of these hallowed hieroglyphics, is by no means essential to the validity of our conclusions respecting them. We think it highly probable, on the whole, that they did *not* understand, at least but partially, their true-meant design. They were doubtless among the things respecting which they 'enquired diligently,' but were obliged to leave their full significancy to be elicited for the edification of subsequent ages of the church. Yet even in the description quoted from Ezekiel there are occasional hints and intimations which might be supposed to lead to a strong suspicion that the Living Creatures were intended to shadow forth *men* instead of *angels*. Thus for instance, it is said, Ezek. 1. 5, 'And this was their appearance; *they had the likeness of a man*;' that is, their predominating aspect was human, notwithstanding their otherwise singular and unearthly form. Again, v. 8, 'And they had the hands of a man under their wings.' The same circumstance is afterwards mentioned concerning the Cherubim, ch. 10. 8, and a second time repeated, v. 21, as something peculiarly note-worthy, that 'there appeared in the cherubims the form of a *man's hand* under their wings.' These remarkable items in the description may be regarded as furnishing at least a slight inuendo as to the true solution of the symbol. But it was reserved for that pen which was to complete the sacred canon, and afford a key to the development of so many preceding mysteries, to give to the student of revelation an inspired exposition of this re-

markable symbol, about which we can no longer doubt, when we hear them ascribing their redemption to the blood of the Lamb.

It may go, moreover, to remove any lingering hesitancy on this point, to consider more closely their relation to the other parts of the typical apparatus of the Tabernacle. They were an abiding fixture upon the Ark of the Covenant; they were stationed upon the extremities of the Mercy-seat with the bright cloud of the Presence beaming between them; they were constructed of the same material with the Mercy-seat, and in every thing seemed to have the most indissoluble connexion with the latent import of this system of shadows, of which Buxtorf remarks; 'It is the opinion of the Jews, that the Ark, with the Mercy-seat and the Cherubim, form the foundation, root, heart, and marrow of the whole Tabernacle, and so of the whole Levitical service.' Now we are authorised to ask, whether it be conceivable that angels are as much interested in the truth and substance of the typical Mercy-seat or Propitiatory, as ransomed sinners, whose happiness, and song, and salvation, all centre in this grand mystery? We would detract nothing from what is justly due to angels; but we see not why, in the very heart of a system of symbols shadowing forth our recovery by a Savior, so prominent a place should be given to the hieroglyphics of a foreign race of beings, however deeply they may be interested in contemplating this work, or serviceable in promoting it. Nothing is more plainly taught in the word of God, than that it is in virtue of the atoning sacrifice of Christ that the Most High dwells amidst the children of men. And this great truth we suppose to have been visibly represented by the habitation of the Divine Glory between the Cherubim and over the Expiation cover of the Ark. But nothing of the nature of an atonement is necessary to propitiate the pres-

ence of God among the sinless angels. Why then should we assign to them, however much we love them, and prize their kind offices, a symbol so pre-eminently appropriate to ourselves? Until therefore we are convinced on solid grounds of the untenableness of our position, and pointed to some passage of holy writ expressly affirming or clearly implying, that the Mosaic Cherubim were emblems of angels, we shall hold them to be representatives of human beings, and of no others.

At the same time we find no difficulty in admitting, in perfect consistency with this theory, that the Cherubim were *popularly regarded* by the ancient Jews, as they still are by modern Christians, as a current designation of some portion at least of the angelic order of beings. Nor do we doubt that Peter, in saying that the things of redemption were things 'which the angels desired to look into,' had direct allusion in his own mind to the position of the Cherubim on the Ark of the Covenant, which stood as if intently poring upon the mysteries couched under both it and the surmounting Glory. Angels usually appeared as *winged* messengers; and *wings* were a striking appendage of the Cherubim. Angels too were always considered as a race of beings abiding near to the Divine Presence in heaven, and as an accompaniment of the Shekinah, whenever and wherever it appeared; the Cherubim, also, in their relation to the Cloud of Glory, were regarded as a *materialized representation* of this great fact, and the Holy of Holies in which they stood was dimly conceived of *as a type of heaven*. Under these circumstances it was natural that the idea of angelic beings should attach to the symbol, and that this idea should be traditionally perpetuated, at least until a more rigid research into the nature and genius of the symbolical language should bring to light its genuine import. That

the Cherubim do actually in their true intent represent *human beings* instead of *angels*, is a conclusion to which we seem to be brought irresistibly by the chain of scriptural induction in the foregoing remarks; and if it should still remain problematical in the mind of the reader on what grounds a device so strikingly *angelic* should have been adopted to represent a *human* reality, we do not hesitate to suggest that the true clue is to be found in the fact, that *the cherubic symbol, in its ultimate scope, pointed forward to that condition of regenerate, redeemed, risen, and glorified men, when they shall have assumed an angelic nature*. Our Savior declares of the happy sons of the resurrection that they shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but shall be as the angels of God in heaven; and when John fell down before the revealing angel of the Apocalypse, and was about to worship him, he was met by the rebuke, 'See that thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book.' Such, we doubt not, is the final destination of the children of God in that future economy to which the eye of faith looks forward; and in the mean time, if the visions of the prophets should portray the scenes of that coming dispensation, where the actors were to be truly men in their post-resurrection natures, how should such actors be symbolically represented but by angels? The Cherubim then may be considered as representatives of angels, so far as angels themselves are representatives of men; but, in our opinion, no farther.

If then our main position in regard to the representative character of the Cherubim, may be considered as established, it only remains to make use of this proof by way of explication of the strange, anomalous, and, we had almost said, monstrous, diversity of forms and faces of which the symbol was

composed. Were the Cherubim *men*—men standing in covenant relation with God—men possessed of renewed spiritual life, and thus enjoying the divine favor—then may we not conclude, that this unique combination of forms *represents some marked and definable attributes in the character of those whom the symbol adumbrates?* What then are the distinguishing traits in the character of the people of God, which may be fitly represented by emblems so unique? How shall the hieroglyphic be read? The face of the Ox reminds us of the qualities of the ox, and these, it is well known, are patient endurance, unwearyed service, and meek submission to the yoke. What claims has he to the title of a man of God who is not distinguished by these ox-like attributes? The Lion is the proper symbol of undaunted courage, glowing zeal, triumph over enemies, united with innate nobleness, and magnanimity of spirit. The Man, as a symbol, we may well conceive as indicating intelligence, meditation, wisdom, sympathy, philanthropy, and every generous and tender emotion. And, finally, in the Eagle we recognise the impersonation of an active, vigilant, fervent, soaring spirit, prompting the readiest and swiftest execution of the divine commands, and elevating the soul to the things that are above.

We admit the affixing of these interpretations to be in a great measure arbitrary, and we hope they may be rejected or improved upon, according as the evidence for or against them may weigh in the mind of the reader. They certainly mean *something*; they have not been adopted without wise reasons; and we would wish to fix upon such a solution as shall carry with it the highest intrinsic probability. In the nature of the case, much must be left to the private judgment, perhaps we might say fancy, of expositors in tracing analogies and assigning meanings to sym-

bols which we yet know in the main to be possessed of meaning.

In adverting, however, to the symbolical import of the straight forward motion of the Cherubim, we have perhaps a more explicit warrant of the Scriptures for our explication. In speaking of this peculiarity, Ezekiel says, 'They went every one straight forward; whithersoever the spirit was to go, they went; they turned not as they went.' Their locomotive progress was directly and undeviatingly *forward*. They turned neither their faces, nor their wings, nor their bodies. There was no digression, regression, wandering, or circuitous wheeling in their movements. In the direction in which their eyes or faces were fixed, their progress tended. Is it not then a rational supposition that by this is indicated that steady and undeviating course of obedience, that determined adherence to the right ways of the Lord, from which the faithful are not to be seduced? Is not *rectitude* the prevailing tenor of a good man's life, and is not his course onward, according to the Apostle's motto, 'forgetting the things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things that are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' Again, let the following passages be noticed in this connexion. Prov. 4. 25—27, 'Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look *straight before thee*. Ponder the path of thy feet, and let all thy ways be established. *Turn not to the right hand nor to the left: remove thy foot from evil.*' Ps. 135. 5, 'As for such as *turn aside unto their crooked ways*, the Lord shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity.' Heb. 12. 13, '*Make straight paths for your feet lest that which is lame be turned out of the way.*' Thus plainly are we taught the teaching of the rectilinear course of the Cherubim, i. e. of the people of God.

Upon the various other items of the

shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy-seat.

19 And make one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end: *even* of the mercy-seat shall ye make the cherubims on the two ends thereof.

prophet's description of these visionary creations, it will scarcely be necessary in this connexion to enlarge. Sufficient has probably been said to establish our main position, that *the Cherubim of the Scriptures are a symbol of holy men, and not, primarily, of holy angels.* The importance of this clue to the mystic device will be obvious to every reader, and will no doubt justify the adaptation of our figure to Ezekiel's rather than to Moses' description. We could not otherwise so well have expanded our remarks in the form of a systematic inquiry into the genuine scope and design of this extraordinary symbol, of which Josephus says, 'They (the Cherubim) are flying creatures, but their form is not like to that of any of the creatures which men have seen; though Moses said he had seen such beings near the throne of God.' The field of investigation, however, in reference to this sacred hieroglyphic is but just entered, and the most enriching results still await the future explorer.—We now return to the material construction of these mystic appendages of the Ark.

*Of beaten work shalt thou make them.* Heb. מִקְשָׁה *mikshah*, *hard work shalt thou make it.* Gr. χρυσότροπον, *golden-turned-work.* This is generally explained as importing, that the Cherubim were to be beaten out with the hammer from the same solid mass of gold with the Mercy-seat, but no such meaning can be gathered from the genuine sense of the original. The term מִקְשָׁה *mikshah*, from קָשָׁה *kashah*, *to be hard*, implies simply that the materials of the Propitiatory and the Cherubim were to be of solid massive gold

20 And o the cherubims shall stretch forth *their* wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces *shall look* one to another; toward the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubims be.

o 1 Kings 8. 7. 1 Chron. 28. 18. Hebr. 9. 5.

in contradistinction from being hollow inside, or made of wood overlaid with gold. Besides, it must be evident to the slightest reflection that such a mode of construction is utterly beyond the art or power of man; it must have been nothing short of a miracle. The cherubic figures were doubtless either cast in a mould or sculptured by the engraver's tool, as the Greek renders the word, and then permanently attached by soldering to either extremity of the Mercy-seat.

19. *Of the mercy-seat shall ye make the cherubims, &c.* A marginal reading, designed to be explanatory of this, is here given, which rests upon no sufficient authority, viz., 'of the matter of the Mercy-seat.' The meaning is simply, that when finished the Cherubim should be seen shooting up from the ends of the Mercy-seat, not that they should be continuously fabricated out of the same mass by a process of beating, which in the nature of the case was absolutely impossible. Of this any man may be convinced who shall take the most plastic and malleable piece of lead, and, with no other instrument than a hammer, endeavor to work it into the shape of a human head or body, or that of a bird or beast, much more into the complex configuration of the cherub. The common interpretation of this passage respecting the formation of the mercy-seat and the Cherubims has been derived from the groundless conceits and puerile glosses of the Rabbinical critics, who wished to multiply as much as possible the number of miracles pertaining to their economy.

20. *Covering the mercy-seat with their wings.* Gr. σπασκία ζωντες εν ταις πτερυξι

21 **p** And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark; and **q** in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee.

22 And **r** there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from **s** between the two cherubims which *are* upon the ark of the testimony, of all *things* which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.

23 ¶ **t** Thou shalt also make a table of shittim-wood: two cubits *shall* be the length thereof, and a cubit

**p** ch. 26. 34. **q** ver. 16. **r** ch. 29. 42, 43. & 30. 6. 36. Lev. 16. 2. Numb. 17. 4. **s** Numb. 7. 89. 1 Sam. 4. 4. 2 Sam. 6. 2. 2 Kings 19. 15. Ps. 80. 1. & 90. 1. Isai. 37. 16. **t** ch. 37. 10. 1 Kings 7. 48. 2 Chron. 4. 8. Hebr. 9. 2.

αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου *shadowing over the propitiatory with their wings*. This word 'shadowing,' instead of 'covering,' is adopted by the apostle, Heb. 9. 5, 'Over it the cherubims of glory *shadowing* the mercy-seat;' where it is to be noted that the phrase 'cherubims of glory' might perhaps be rendered cherubims of the glory; i. e. the glory of the Shekinah, the luminous splendid appearance which was visibly enthroned between them, the mystery or substance of which is disclosed to us in the visions of the Apocalypse, ch. 5, where we learn that the symbol of the divine glory dwelling between the Cherubim was the hieroglyphic of the Son of God dwelling in the midst of his redeemed people, receiving their adorations and bestowing upon them the tokens of his complacency.—¶ Shall look one to another. Heb. אִישׁ אֶל אָחִיו *ish el ahiv*, a man to his brother; a common Hebrew idiom for expressing the idea of our version.

22. *There I will meet with thee*. Heb. נִדְעָדְתִּי לְךָ שָׁם *năditi leka sham*, I will convene with thee there. Gr. γνωσθήσεται σοι ἐκεῖθεν, *I will be known to thee there*. Chal. 'I will appoint my Word to

the breadth thereof, and a cubit and a half the height thereof.

24 And thou shalt overlay it with pure gold, and make thereto a crown of gold round about.

25 And thou shalt make unto it a border of an hand-breadth round about, and thou shalt make a golden crown to the border thereof round about.

26 And thou shalt make for it four rings of gold, and put the rings in the four corners that *are* on the four feet thereof.

27 Over against the border shall the rings be for places of the staves to bear the table.

28 And thou shalt make the staves of shittim-wood, and overlay them

thee there.' That is, on the mercy-seat, between the cherubim. Here the visible Glory of Jehovah was to reside and to give audience, as a sovereign on his throne, having the ark as his footstool, as it seems to be termed, Ps. 99. 5—132. 7. From the same root with נִדְעָדְתִּי *năditi*, viz. יָעַד *yăad*, to meet by appointment, comes מוֹעֵד *môad* appointed meeting or convention, whence the Tabernacle is called מוֹעֵד אֹהֶל *ohel môad*, tabernacle of Convention. See Note on Ex. 33. 7.

#### THE TABLE OF SHEW-BREAD.

23—28. *Thou shalt also make a table, &c.* This part of the sacred furniture keeps up still farther the analogy with a royal palace, to which we have before adverted as pervading the entire structure of the Tabernacle. Yet a purely spiritual drift is at the same time sufficiently discernible in the typical aliment with which it was provided, and which pointed to the nourishment of the soul, and not of the body. As to the table itself, it was constructed of the same material with the Ark, viz. shittim-wood overlaid with gold. It was also furnished with rings or sta-



with gold, that the table may be borne with them.

29 And thou shalt make <sup>u</sup>the

<sup>u</sup> ch. 37. 16. Numb. 4. 7.

ples, through which were passed the staves by which it was carried, in the same way as the Ark. These staves, however, did not remain in the rings when at rest, like those of the Ark, v. 15, but were, as Josephus informs us, removed, that they might not be in the way of the priests in their weekly ministrations at the table. The table was inferior to the Ark in breadth by half a cubit; but it was of the same height, and stood lengthwise, east and west, at the north side of the Holy Place. From the obscurity of the ancient terms there is some difficulty in determining with precision the details of its form; but what we seem to learn from the text is, that the platform or surface of the table had its edges faced with a perpendicular border, or enclosure, somewhat resembling a window-frame before it is inserted into the wall of a building or the

dishes thereof, and spoons thereof, and covers thereof, and bowls thereof, to cover withal: *of pure gold* shalt thou make them.

sashes put in. This border was to be of a hand's breadth and ornamented on its upper and lower edge with a beautiful golden cornice or moulding, which is here also, as in the case of the Ark, called a 'crown.' The upper rim of the border rose of course somewhat above the superficial level of the table, and was well adapted to prevent what was deposited thereon from falling off. The Table, as seen in the Arch of Titus at Rome, on which the spoils of the Temple are represented, shows but very little of the ornamental work described in the text; but this, it is supposed, was not the Table of the Tabernacle. It is generally agreed that this was among the spoils carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, and that when the Jews were restored to their own land, they made a new Table. The view given in the cut is deduced from the text.




TABLE OF SHEW BREAD.

30 And thou shalt set upon the table w shew-bread before me alway.

w Lev. 24. 5, 6.

29. *Dishes.* Heb. קַעֲרֹת *ke-aroht*, dishes, or chargers, as the word is translated Num. 7. 13. Gr. *τροβλία*, plates or platters, on which it is supposed by some, that the loaves of bread were placed. Others, however, assign different uses to these dishes. It is a point which cannot be positively determined.—¶ *Spoons.* Heb. כַּפֹּת *kappoth*, more properly cups or censers of concave form like spoons, or like the hollow of the hand, which is the primitive meaning of the original כַּף *kaph*. They were for holding incense (Num. 7. 14), which it is evident from Lev. 24. 7, was employed in conjunction with the holy bread. It is supposed there were two of them, one placed on each pile of loaves.—¶ *Covers.* Heb. קְשוֹת *kesoth*; probably for covering both the loaves and the incense. The Gr. renders the word wherever it occurs by *σπονδεῖα*, libation-vessels.—¶ *Bowls.* Heb. בִּנְקִיּוֹת *menakkioth*. Gr. *κυαδοί*, wine-cups. 'For though we do not read that any wine was set upon this table, yet as libations were made to God by pouring out wine before him in the Holy Place, there is nothing improbable in the Jewish tradition, that a bowl of excellent wine was always kept upon the table; and that once a week, when the bread was changed, the contents were poured out as a libation before the Lord. Josephus confirms this tradition by relating that when Pompey went into the Holy Place, he saw there cups for libation among the sacred vessels.' *Pict. Bible.*—¶ *To cover withal.* Heb. אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא *asher yussak bah'en*, with which it was poured out; with which the drink-offerings were made. This sense agrees better with the meaning of the original נָסַךְ *nasak*, and with the probable uses of the 'bowls.' There is no sufficient authority for rendering the original by 'cover.'

30. *Show-bread.* Heb. לֶחֶם פָּנִים *le-hem panim*, bread of faces, or 'bread of presence (presence bread).' This title is usually supposed to be derived from its being continually set before the face or presence of God, as manifested in his visible symbol in the sanctuary, and that too although they were deposited in the Holy, and not in the Most Holy place. But the true grounds of the appellation will be fully considered in the sequel. The Gr. of the Sept. renders it by *αρτους ενωπιους*, fore-placed loaves, and that of Sym. *αρτους της προθεσεως*, loaves of proposition, which is the constant reading of Jerome in the Latin Vulgate. Twelve cakes or loaves of this bread answering to the twelve tribes, were set upon the table in two separate rows of six each, which were renewed every sabbath; when the old were taken away and eaten by the priests. This is not particularly mentioned in the present text, supplementary to which is the information more expressly given, Lev. 24. 5—9, 'And thou shalt take fine flour, and bake twelve cakes thereof: two tenth-deals shall be in one cake. And thou shalt set them in two rows, six on a row, upon the pure table before the Lord. And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord. Every sabbath he shall set it in order before the Lord continually, being taken from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant. And it shall be Aaron's and his sons'; and they shall eat it in the holy place; for it is most holy unto him of the offerings of the Lord made by fire by a perpetual statute.'

Of the spiritual or typical design of this part of the apparatus of the Tabernacle, we cannot speak with much confidence, because we consider the full

*realization* of its import, like most other things pertaining to the Tabernacle and Temple, to be yet future. They look forward, as we conceive, to that final earthly consummation of the Gospel economy which is announced in the predictions of Scripture under the title of the New Jerusalem. This state, we consider as one in which the terrestrial and the celestial are to be merged together in a manner which we cannot at present adequately understand. It is only, therefore, by studying profoundly what is vaguely and mystically intimated of that coming glorious dispensation, that we can attach their proper significance to the various symbols of the Mosaic economy. It is a period when Christ's kingdom is to be fully manifested, and he himself says, Luke 22. 30, that he has a table in his kingdom, at which all his saints shall for ever eat and drink with him. He will then sup with them and they with him, and they shall be abundantly satisfied with the goodness of the Lord's house. As to any more distinct application of these emblems to the particular features, institutions, or ordinances, of the present Gospel economy, which may seem to afford their counterparts, we are not disposed to object to it, or deny that it may be well founded, but for the full and complete substantiation of the Mosaic shadows we look to the future.

But we will enter into a little fuller examination of the subject, and in order to give as much precision as possible to our inquiries, it will be necessary to weigh with the utmost practical accuracy the import of the title **לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים** *lehem happanim*, *the bread of the face or presence*. This, as intimated above, is usually understood as equivalent to *the bread set before God's face*. But whether this was mainly with the ideal purpose of *being seen by God*, i.e. the Shekinah, dwelling in the holy of holies, or *by men*, is not entirely obvious. Accord-

ing to the first supposition, it would be viewed either merely as a kind of offering presented in token of gratitude for the daily bread by which life is sustained, and upon which Jehovah might be considered as looking down from his throne on the mercy-seat with special complacency; or as directly the apparent food of God himself regarded as theocratic king of Israel, having his abode in a palace richly furnished with all the common necessities and comforts of life. According to the second hypothesis, the Shew-bread was something which was to be viewed by the people as a sign of the divine care and providence in their behalf, intended to awaken a thankful recollection of the source from whence flowed the daily bread which went to the sustentation of their natural life. This is the view taken by Lightfoot and Carpzov. But to this whole mode of exposition it is justly objected, that there is no sufficient authority for ascribing to **הַפָּנִים** *happanim* when standing alone the sense of *before* or *in the sight* or *presence* of any thing, as if it were equivalent to **לֶחֶם לְפָנֵי יְהוָה** *lehem liphnē Yehorah*, *bread before the Lord*. It will be observed that the original in the passage before is, 'and thou shalt set upon the table **לֶחֶם פָּנִים לְפָנַי** *lehem panim liphnai*, *bread of face before me* alway.' Here then as that which the interpretation we are considering understands by **פָּנִים** *panim*, *face* or *presence*, is actually expressed by **לְפָנַי** *liphnai*, *before me*, it follows that **פָּנִים** *panim* must necessarily convey some other idea than merely that of *proposition* or *setting before*. The same consequence follows also from the denomination of the Table, Num. 4. 7, viz., **שֻׁלְחָן הַפָּנִים** *shulchan happanim*, *table of face or presence*. If this article were called *the table of the presence*, simply from its position, what reason can be assigned why the Candlestick, and more especially the Altar of Incense which stood

between the Table and the Candlestick and still more directly in front of the throne than either, should not equally be distinguished by the same epithet? Yet we nowhere find them so denominated, though it is said of the Altar, Lev. 16. 18, **אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה** *asher liphnē Yehovah*, which is before the Lord; from which it appears how the original expresses itself, when it would convey the idea so erroneously attributed to **הַפָּנִים** *hapanim*.

On the same grounds, we are constrained to reject the idea of the Shewbread's being intended as an offering and sign of national thankfulness for national favors. For if it received on this account the predicate **הַפָּנִים**, the question immediately occurs, as before, why this predicate is applied to the Table and not to the Altar of Incense, which no less than the Table stood before the Lord in the holy place? And as to its serving as a *visible remembrance* of the divine providence towards the chosen people, how is this consistent with the circumstance of its being placed in the sacred apartment, entirely hidden from public view, and visible only to the priests in the discharge of their offices? How could that be a visible sign which was not *seen*? And why should that bread which, from its symbolic relations, might be readily presumed to point forward to a *future spiritual sustenance*, be understood as emblematic of a *present physical aliment* daily supplied by a bounteous providence?

We are thrown then upon another interpretation of the phrase before us, and though the idea which we suppose to be conveyed by it is somewhat complex, yet we flatter ourselves with being able to make it intelligible. It is clear that the expression in the original **לֶחֶם פָּנִים** *lehem panim*, bread of the presence, is strikingly analogous with **מַלְאֲךְ פָּנִים** *malak panim*, angel of the presence, Is. 63. 9, 'In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence

(**מַלְאֲךְ פָּנִים**) saved them,' &c. So also Ex. 33. 14, 15, 'And he said, *My presence* (**פָּנַי** *panai*) shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest. And he said unto him, if *thy presence* (**פָּנֶיךָ** *panika*) go not with me, carry us not up hence? Compare with this Deut. 4. 37, 'And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in *his sight* (**בְּפָנָיו** *bepanav*, with, by, or through his presence; i. e. the angel of his presence), with his mighty power out of Egypt.' But the Angel of the divine Face or Presence, of whom God says, 'my name is in him,' we have before shown to be no other than the Shekinah or the *visible manifestation* of Jehovah, as he was anciently pleased to make himself known to his people. His essential being will no doubt for ever remain inscrutable to created intelligences. If he reveals himself it must be through some medium which will bring him measurably within the comprehension of his creatures. This medium he denominates his *face* or *presence*; and as the human face is the principal means of revealing the inward being and character of a man, so the Shekinah is called the *face of God*, inasmuch as it is through this medium that the Divinity comes within the sphere of human cognition. Now let it be borne in mind that the Shekinah, i. e. the Angel of the Presence, is but the Old Testament designation of Christ, and the phrase **לֶחֶם פָּנִים** *lehem panim*, bread of the presence, is brought into immediate identity of import with *bread of Christ*, who was the *true presence* indicated by the term. But what is the bread of Christ but that divine spiritual sustenance which maintains the inner, higher, and eternal life of his believing followers? In order then to gain a full apprehension of the purport of the Table of Shewbread and its mystic loaves, we must have recourse to such passages as the following; John, 6. 32—58, 'Then

31 ¶ \* And thou shalt make a candlestick of pure gold : of beaten work shall the candlestick be made :

\* ch. 37. 17. 1 Kings, 7. 49. Zech. 4. 2. Hebr. 9. 2. Rev. 1. 12. & 4. 5.

Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven ; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever : and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat ? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven : not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead : he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.

Now it is well known that this is the great evangelical truth which is significantly shadowed forth in the sacramental bread of the Lord's Supper, the lively emblem of that spiritual aliment which he gives to his faithful household. *The mystery of the Table of Shew-bread is substantially the same with that of the Table spread with the emblems of the*

*Lord's body and blood.* It was a sensible and lively, though still inadequate 'shew' of the nourishment of that holy, hidden, spiritual life which is to be consummated in that coming world of glory, where the face of God will be revealed without a cloud, in joyful foresight of which the Psalmist exclaims Ps. 17. 15, 'As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness ; I shall be satisfied, when I awake with thy likeness,'—a plain allusion to the beatific vision in heaven. Then shall his servants 'see his face,' and because they shall 'see him as he is,' therefore shall they 'be like him.' 'In his presence is fullness of joy, and at his right hand are pleasures for evermore.' This ravishing and transforming view of the glorious presence of the Lord shall be an eternal *feast* to the blessed beholders, and it is doubtless from the intimate ideal relation between this *seeing* and *eating* that the bread of the Tabernacle is called the *bread of the face or presence*. The whole points directly to Christ, and is fulfilled only in him when he shall come the second time without sin unto salvation, shedding the *light of his countenance* in one endless and *soul-satisfying* blaze upon his redeemed ones. Their *vision* shall be eternal *fruition*. Thus we have obtained a view of the subject which shows the intimate connexion of the ideas of 'Bread' and 'Face' or 'Presence,' and with how much propriety the adjunct פָּנִים *panim* is applied to the Tabernacle-table, while it is withheld from any other article of the sacred furniture.

#### THE CANDLESTICK.

31. *Thou shalt make a candlestick.* Heb. מְנוֹרָתָא *menorath*, a candelabrum, a lamp-bearer. As 'candlestick' with us imports but a single upright shaft, the term fails to give us an idea at all

adequate of the construction of this article of the Tabernacle furniture. It consisted of a base or shaft, with seven branches, three on each side, and one in the middle. These branches were all parallel to one another, and were worked out in bowls, knobs (knops), and flowers, placed alternately, of which we shall shortly give a more particular description. On the extremity of each branch was a golden lamp, whose light was supplied by pure olive oil, prepared in a peculiar way, as will be seen by the Note on Ex. 27. 20. This Candlestick, which is affirmed by Josephus to have been hollow within, was wholly of pure gold, and weighed a talent (about 125 lbs.), although nothing is said of its height, thickness, or any of its dimensions. Nor is mention made of any kind of foot or pediment on which it rested, though we cannot doubt that it had one. The Jewish writers suppose that its height was about double that of the Table of Shew-bread and of the Altar of Incense, which would give it a very majestic appearance, and probably require a stool for lighting and trimming it, while at the same time it was not so much raised as to endanger the curtain-roof of the Tabernacle. It was placed on the south or left hand side of the holy place, as one entered, the row of lamps being probably parallel with the wall, though Lightfoot thinks that that described, Rev. 1. 12, 13, was perpendicular to it. It is a point, however, which it is difficult to determine, and about which the Rabbinical writers are not agreed. The oil for the seven lamps was to be supplied in such quantities as to keep them always burning. It is indeed imagined by some expositors that they did not perpetually burn, but were lighted every evening and went out one after another in the morning, an opinion which is no doubt favored at first view by several passages in the sacred writers. Thus for instance in 1 Sam. 3. 3, mention is

made of the lamp of God going out in the Temple; and in 2 Chron. 13. 11, we read of 'setting in order the candlestick of gold with the lamps thereof, to burn every evening.' So also in Ex. 30. 7, 8, it is mentioned as the duty of the priest to 'dress' the lamps every morning, and to 'light' them every evening. But then on the other hand in the parallel text, Lev. 24. 2, it is said that the lamps were to burn continually, and though this term is not in itself absolutely decisive of the fact, as *continually* is often used in the sense of *regularly*, *statedly*, yet when we add the authority of Josephus, who was himself a priest, and not likely to be ignorant on this subject, it would seem to put the matter beyond question. He says expressly that the lamps continued to burn day and night. And there would seem in fact to have been a necessity for this, unless the priests ministered in the dark; for as there were no windows in the Tabernacle, light could only be admitted through the curtained entrance at the east or unboarded end; and unless that entrance were left open, which we do not learn that it was, the holy place might have been so dark as to render artificial light not less requisite by day than by night. At any rate, it is obvious that the most holy place, where the Ark lay, was entirely dependent for light, when it had any, upon the lamps of the golden Candlestick. This fact explains another allusion in reference to the heavenly city in the Apocalypse, the connexion of which with the holy of holies we have endeavored to show on a preceding page. In Rev. 22. 5, it is said, 'And there shall be no night there; and *they need no candle*, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light.' In this respect the *substance* differed from the *shadow*. The typical heaven needed the artificial light of the lamps of the Candlestick; the *anti-typical* did not. 'The Lamb is the light thereof.'

his shaft, and his branches, his

bowls, his knops, his flowers, shall be of the same.

Having thus given a general view of the plan and uses of the golden Candlestick, we enter upon the more minute description of its individual parts.

*Of beaten work.* Heb. מִקְשָׁה *mikshah*, of hard or solid work; i. e. made of the solid material, having no wood-work about it, though Josephus represents it as being hollow. Our present rendering 'beaten work' is peculiarly unfortunate, as it leads the reader to suppose that several of the most exquisite fabrics of the Tabernacle were wrought out by a process of 'beating' with a hammer, than which nothing, we conceive, can be farther from the fact, as they were undoubtedly cast in moulds. So far as the present term is concerned, which is used several times in the narrative, it is designed to acquaint us solely with the *character of the material*, and not with the *process of formation*. See the remarks above on the use of the term, v. 18, in reference to the construction of the Cherubim.—¶ *His shaft.* Heb. יֶרֶךָ *yerikah*, *her shaft*; and so in all the following terms, קָנָה *kanah*, *her branches*, &c., instead of 'his.' The original term יֶרֶךָ *yerek*, properly signifies a *thigh*, but here is understood by the Rabbins of the *base or thick lower part* on which the main branch (קָנָה) rested and from which it rose. We suppose, therefore, the term יֶרֶךָ *yerek* to have been applied to that thick and massive portion of the stock which extended upwards from the foot or bottom to the point where the lowermost pair of branches separated.—¶ *His branches.* Heb. קָנָה *kanah*, *her branch*. The word properly signifies a *reed or cane*, which each of the branches probably somewhat resembled; indeed nothing is more remarkable, as we shall soon see, throughout this description of the Candlestick, than the employment of terms evidently drawn from the dis-

tinguishing parts of plants and trees, indicating a striking affinity in its structure, with the forms of the *vegetable* world. The reason of this singular fact we shall hope to elucidate in our remarks on the typical import of the Candlestick. In the present case the original term, though singular in form, has really a plural import, being intended to denote *all* the branches collectively, as appears from the next verse, and from the Greek rendering καλαμισκοι, *little reeds or canes*. Of these the middle one, constituting the main trunk of it, was of course the most important. And hence in v. 33, 34, and Chron. 3. 20, it is actually called by the name מְנוֹרָה *menorah* of the whole Candlestick. It is not indeed expressly so distinguished in the present text, and the reason we suppose to be, that all the lower part of the stock or trunk up to the point where the different arms branched off, three on either side, was called יֶרֶךָ *yerek*, or *thigh*. Of the thickness of the central or the side branches we have no intimation, but Jarchi and Abenezra agree with Josephus, who denominates them λεπτοὺς, *slender*.—¶ *His bowls.* Heb. גִּבְיָה *gebia*, *calyx or cup*; so called from its resemblance to that part of the plant from which the flower springs. The Gr. however has κρατῆρες, *bowls*, and the Vulg. scyphos, *cups*, from which the English rendering has flowed. The appendages here called 'bowls,' 'knops,' and 'flowers,' were mere ornamental devices, intended, it would seem, to give to each of the branches the appearance of a succession of *fruits* and *flowers*. As to the form of the 'bowls,' it is clear from v. 33, that they had some relation to the 'almond,' but in what respect, it is not easy to determine. The phrase in the original is גִּבְיִים מְשֻׁקָּדִים *gebiim meshukkadim*.

which is to be literally rendered *cups made or figured almond-wise*, by which perhaps is to be understood nothing more than that this calyx-shaped ornament was to be fashioned in imitation of the calyx of the almond, rather than of any other plant. The expression is less likely to have denoted the *flower of the almond*, because the flower-work is denoted by another term, and because the term 'almond-wise' is in some way inseparably connected with the original for *cups* or *bowls*, as if to indicate their form. For this purpose the calyx would be much more suitable than the corolla. But it may be asked whether the bowls were not shaped like the *fruit* or *nut* of the almond, the shell of which when divided into its halves presents the appearance of small scolloped vessels like our spoons. To

this we can only say, that if such appendages were intended as *containing vessels*, they would not only be *useless* in the place which they occupied,—for what were they to hold?—but would be very unsightly and out of keeping as ornaments. If, moreover, they were intended to represent the *fruit* of the almond, then besides the intrinsic inappropriateness of the term, they would trench upon what we suppose to have been the design of the 'knops,' which is soon to be explained. On the whole, therefore, we seem to be shut up to the conclusion stated above, that the 'bowls' were exquisitely wrought ornaments in the shape of the *calyx of the almond flower*; and the annexed cut of the blossoms, flowers, and fruit of this plant may essentially aid our conception of this part of the workmanship.



THE ALMOND.

**His knops.** Heb. כַּפְתֹּרִים *kaph-torim*. Gr. σφαῖραι, *spheres*. Vulg. *sphærules*, *little spheres*. The term here employed receives but little light from

biblical usage. It is only in Amos, 9. 1, and Zeph. 2. 14, that כַּפְתֹּר *kaph-tor*, occurs, in the first of which it is rendered 'door' and in the other 'lin



tel,' and doubtless erroneously in both. It is probably to be understood in each case of some *round moulding, rows of knobs*, or other architectural ornaments of spherical form about the heads of pillars. The Rabbins with somewhat remarkable unanimity interpret it here by 'apple,' and Josephus expressly likens it to the 'pomegranate' (granate-apple), of which a cut and a full account is given hereafter; and we learn from 1 Kings, 7. 18, that the chapiters of the pillars in Solomon's Temple were adorned with pomegranates. Maimonides says, 'The *kaphtor* had the figure of a little globe, yet not exactly round, but somewhat oblong, like an egg.' He does not, however, it will be observed, recognise any allusion to the form of the pomegranate, and as the proper Hebrew for pomegranate is not כַּפְתֹּר *kaphtor*, but רִמּוֹן *rimmon*, we incline to think that the *shelled fruit* of the almond itself is intended, which the reader will perceive bears a striking resemblance to the form of an egg, and was well calculated for a decoration of such a fabric as the Candlestick. We understand then by the term in this connexion those *rounded spherical swells* or *knobs* occurring alternately with the calyxes and flowers, along the length of the several branches, and which were expressly intended to represent some kind of *fruit*; and that fruit, if we rightly conceive of the matter, was the *nut of the almond*.—  
 ¶ *His flowers.* Heb. פְּרָחִיהָ *perahühah*. Gr. κρίνα, *lillies*. Vulg. *lilia*; and so also Maimonides and Josephus. But the word in the original is the general word for *flowers*, or rather for the *blossoms of trees*; and we have nothing to guide us, in fixing upon any particular species. Yet as the other connected terms have a dominant reference to the *almond tree*, we seem to discover an intrinsic probability that the allusion is the same in the case before us; and this suggestion receives perhaps an in-


direct support from what is said Num. 17. 8, of the budding and blossoming of Aaron's rod; 'And it came to pass on the morrow Moses went into the tabernacle of witness; and, behold, the rod of Aaron for the house of Levi *was budded* (פָּרַח *parah*), and *brought forth buds* (יֹצֵא פֶרֶחַ *yotzë parah*), and bloomed blossoms, and yielded *almonds*.' In both passages we find פֶּרֶחַ *perah* used in connexion with the *almond*, and we shall see in the sequel that the evidence in favor of this interpretation is much increased by what will be shown to have been the spiritual or typical uses of the Candlestick.

Asto the manner in which this three-fold variety of ornament was arranged relatively to each other on the branches, the text is not free from ambiguity. If our conception of the form were governed solely by what is said v. 33, we should perhaps infer that there was but one knop and one flower to the three bowls on each of the branches, as the two former are expressed by words in the singular, while 'bowls' is in the plural. Yet upon comparing the subsequent verses, and making up our idea of the whole, we cannot well resist the conclusion, that the bowls, knops, and flowers formed together one complex ornament which was three times repeated on each of the six side-branches, and four times on the central one. And thus we have represented them in the annexed original draft of the Candlestick, in which the reader will recognise the results of the foregoing researches and reasonings. It will be found to differ very considerably from the model given in the Candlestick represented on the Arch of Titus. But it is to be remembered that the utensils carried away by Vespasian were not the same with those made by Moses; and Josephus says the Candlestick was especially altered from its original form. The Mosaic Candlestick was transferred to the Temple and lost in the Babylonish captivity.

32 And six branches shall come out of the sides of it ; three branches of the candlestick out of the one side, and three branches of the candlestick out of the other side :

33 Three bowls made like unto

almonds, *with* a knop and a flower in one branch ; and three bowls made like almonds in the other branch, *with* a knop and a flower : so in the six branches that come out of the candlestick.



THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

As the Candlestick of the Tabernacle forms a constituent part of a system preeminently symbolical and typical, no good reason can be assigned why it should not, like the other sacred things with which it is connected, possess a *meaning* suited to the economy of which it formed a part. Its adaptation to its *primary* or *material* uses is evident ; and equally obvious, if we mistake not, will appear its fitness to the *spiritual* ends which it was intended to answer. In the attempt to ascertain and settle these upon satisfactory grounds, it will be important to draw largely upon various portions of holy writ, through which the light of the Tabernacle-lamps shines more or less distinctly, and from the concentrated rays of which we are to deduce its ultimate scope. The inquiry naturally divides itself into two dis-

tinct heads, the one in reference to the typical purport of the Lights, the other, that of the Candlestick viewed as a whole composed of its shaft and branches.

(1.) *The Lights.* As our grand object in this part of the investigation is, to obtain the unequivocal sanction of the Scriptures themselves for the solution which we propose to give to the symbol before us, we are naturally referred to those passages where an express mention of the Candlestick occurs, or which contain such allusions to its mystical import as will serve to guide us to correct conclusions. Several such places may be cited from which it will appear that *Light*, in its most genuine usage as a symbol, stands for *knowledge*, or rather that kind of *sacred intelligence* or *moral illumination*

34 And in the candlestick *shall* be four bowls made like unto al-  
monds, *with* their knops and their flowers.

which has for its object *the things of God*, and for its author *the Holy Spirit*, the great fountain of all *spiritual light*. The remarks of Pres. Edwards in his 'Notes on the Bible' may be pertinently cited in this connexion. 'In the golden Candlestick that stood before the throne, on the left side was a representation both of the Holy Spirit and of the Church. The pure oil olive that fed the lamps is indisputably a type of the Holy Ghost; and it is evident, from Rev. 4. 5, compared with chap. 1. 4, and v. 6, and Zech. 3. 9, and 4. 2, 6, 10. The burning of the lamp represents that divine, infinite, pure energy and ardor wherein the Holy Spirit consists. The light of the lamps filling the Tabernacle with light which had no windows, and no light but of those lamps, represents the divine, blessed communication and influence of the Spirit of God, replenishing the church and filling heaven with the light of divine knowledge in opposition to the darkness of ignorance and delusion, with the light of holiness in opposition to the darkness of sin, and with the light of comfort and joy in opposition to the darkness of sorrow and misery.'

As this light however is communicated for the most part through the intervention of certain agencies set apart for that purpose, it is quite natural that it should be symbolically exhibited in concentrated form, in those artificial luminaries with which all men are familiar. The light of the Tabernacle answers to the light of the church; and the light of the church is the light of the Spirit of God dispensed through such media as it has pleased infinite wisdom to adopt. Of these the *sacred ministry* is perhaps the chief; and though the ministers of Christ shine with a borrowed lustre, merely *reflecting*, like mirrors, the rays of the great fountain

of light, yet we see a peculiar propriety and felicity in their being symbolised by the *lamps* or *lights* of the golden Candlestick. This will appear more strikingly evident by recurrence to the mystic scenery of the Apocalypse. In the opening vision of that book, chap. 1. John, hearing a voice behind him turns and beholds seven golden candlesticks and in the midst of them one like unto the Son of Man clothed with a long priestly tunic or robe, and girt about the breast with a golden girdle. This indicated that the character in which he now appeared was a priestly character, and that the action which he performed was a priestly action. What this action was and what it was designed to shadow forth, will be easily inferred from the circumstances of the vision. The scene of it is undoubtedly laid in the outer room or holy place of the Tabernacle, where the priests were wont to officiate, and where among other things it was the duty of some one of the number to see to the lighting, trimming, and snuffing the lamps of the golden Candlestick, which was done just as it began to grow dark in the evening. Imagine the apostle then, about the hour of twilight, standing without, near the entrance of the holy place, and looking in to the further end of the room, and there beholding the Great High Priest of the Christian Church occupied about the lights of the seven distinct golden candlesticks into which the one large candelabrum of the Tabernacle is multiplied under the New Testament economy. These lights thus seen from a distance in a room otherwise dark would have very much the appearance of *stars*, and it would be scarcely a stretch of language to say that the person employed in trimming and dressing the lamps, with his hand passing to and fro from one to the other, *held the stars in*

his right hand. Such at any rate we doubt not was the imagery presented to the entranced perception of the seer, and as the action was unquestionably symbolic, our next object is to ascertain its meaning. But to this we have a luminous clue in the words of the divine hierophant himself v. 19, 20, 'Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter; the mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches.' Here then we learn that the seven stars are the seven angels of the seven churches, while the seven Candlesticks are the churches themselves. But the *angels* of the churches are, in symbolical diction, the *ministers*, the *elders*, the *collective pastorship*, of the churches; and as we have shown the *stars* and the *lights* or *lamps* to be equivalent symbols, it follows that the lights set upon the respective Candlesticks are the *spiritual teachers*, the *moral luminaries*, appointed to impart spiritual and moral light to the churches. Viewed in connexion with this, how striking is our Savior's language, Mat. 5. 15, as applied to ministers of the gospel, to whom it was no doubt *primarily* intended to apply, 'Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light to all that are in the house.' But the Apocalyptic visionings referred to require still farther explication. John not only saw the emblematic objects and action described, but he received a command also which disclosed the drift of the whole. He was ordered to address, in the name of Christ, seven epistles to the seven Asiatic Churches filled with reproofs, counsels, admonitions, and urgent exhortations, the design of which was to revive the decaying light, or in other words to quicken the lan-

guishing graces, both of the pastors and people of those churches, which from being embraced in the number of universality (seven) appear to have stood as representatives of *all* Christian churches down through the successive periods of time to the era of his second coming. This work, therefore, put forth by John in the name of Christ upon the churches by these epistles was the very work which was symbolically represented by the action of the Savior in trimming and dressing the lamps of the golden candlesticks. Each epistle was the application of the symbolical snuffers to each of the churches; but in a more especial manner to the *ministers* or *teachers* of the churches.

We gather from this explanation the clearest evidence of the truth of our main position, that the material lights of the Candlestick represented the spiritual lights of the church. The same view of this symbolical fabric applies to the object presented under some circumstantial varieties of form and aspect in the vision of Zechariah, ch. 4. 1—3, 'And the angel that talked with me came again, and waked me, as a man that is wakened out of his sleep, and said unto me, What seest thou? And I said, I have looked, and behold a candlestick, all of gold, with a bowl upon the top of it, and his seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes to the seven lamps, which are upon the top thereof; and two olive-trees by it, one upon the right side of the bowl, and the other upon the left side thereof.' The candlestick seen by the prophet differed from that made by Moses by being surmounted by a bowl, out of which, as from a reservoir, the oil was conducted through golden pipes to each of the lamps; and this bowl was moreover supplied by oil that flowed in a peculiar manner through two branches of two olive-trees standing on either side of the Candlestick, v. 11—14. This part of the vision especially attracted the curiosity and in-

terest of the prophet. 'Then answered I, and said unto him, What are these two olive-trees upon the right side of the candlestick and upon the left side thereof? And I answered again, and said unto him, What be these two olive branches which through the two golden pipes empty the golden oil out of themselves? And he answered me and said, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my lord. Then said he, These are the two anointed ones (Heb. 'sons of oil'), that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.' These variations from the Mosaic model are certainly very remarkable; still in general significance we have no doubt the symbol in each case is the same. The Candlestick with its branches and its lighted lamps, represents the church in its multiplied unity, as a medium for shedding abroad the beams of revealed truth amidst the darkness of a benighted world. But as the natural light of lamps is sustained by oil, so spiritual light is sustained by *truth*. Truth is its appropriate and genuine pabulum; and in the imagery of the vision before us, the obvious design is to represent the manner in which the churches are furnished with the nourishment of truth. Is not this from the Scriptures of truth, and are not the Old and New Testaments strikingly and adequately shadowed forth by the two olive-trees out of which the mystic oil was elaborated and conveyed to its golden receptacles? Here then we have the true clue to the 'two witnesses' of the Revelation, ch. 11. 3, 4. 'And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive-trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth.' The two witnesses are *two kinds of witnesses*, one of each, but most intimately related to each other, and their symbolical identity with the two olive-trees and

the two candlesticks is here *expressly asserted by the Holy Ghost*. How vain then must be every attempt to settle the significance of these mystic agents of the Apocalypse without first determining the genuine import of the Old Testament imagery here depicted? This we have endeavored to do in the foregoing remarks, and just in proportion to the evidence there adduced of the truth of our explanation is the evidence that by the 'two witnesses' of John is meant the *Scriptures* and the *Churches*—that is, the true, genuine, duly constituted apostolical churches—which have in fact been in all ages, except when suppressed, the main *witnesses* of God to the eyes and ears of corrupt and apostate christendom. In the prophecy of the Apocalypse it is clearly announced that the evil predominance of a great Antichristian power, called the Beast, should avail to cause these witnesses to prophesy in sackcloth, or in an embarrassed condition, for the space of twelve hundred and sixty years, and at last for a short period to suppress them altogether; after which they were again to rise from their extinction and recommence in an open, public, and acknowledged manner the exercise of their suspended functions. This is undoubtedly the great *truth* which the imagery was intended to shadow forth, and for the verification of this truth we are thrown upon the resources of history. But this process we must necessarily leave to be followed out by others. It constitutes the appropriate province of the expositor of the Apocalypse.

To the reader who would desire a more full expansion of the idea here advanced respecting the typical import of the Lights of the golden candlestick, we have great pleasure in recommending 'Stonard's Commentary on the Vision of Zechariah,' Lond. 1824, an abstract of which will be found in Robinson's edition of Calmet, under the article 'Candlestick.' This work exhibits one

of the most admirable specimens of the sober and scriptural interpretation of prophetic symbols to be found in the English or any other language. The German treatise also of Bähr, entitled 'Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus,' will be found an important auxiliary in this field of Biblical exposition. It is exceedingly desirable that both these works should be made accessible to the mass of English readers of the Scriptures. Our own conclusions, however, have been arrived at by a process conducted for the most part independently of either.

(2.) *The Candlestick.* To the symbolical purport of the Candlestick, considered more particularly in reference to its construction with ornamented shaft and branches, we have already obtained a clue in the express declaration of the Savior to John; 'The mystery of the seven candlesticks is the seven churches.' Since then a candlestick in general is the scriptural symbol of a church, a candlestick with seven branches must be the symbol of the universal church, spread abroad through all its numerous particular congregations, each one in its allotted station, shining through both its members and ministers, and giving light to the world. For the number *seven* being used by the sacred writers to denote not merely an indefinite multitude, but *totality* and *perfection*, the seven branches are doubtless to be understood as denoting *all* the various and dispersed congregations of the great spiritual body; while their all proceeding from one shaft plainly implies, that all those congregations are united in the one body of the universal church. 'In this character,' says Stonard, 'the church began to show itself, when the children of Israel, grown into a numerous people, were first collected and incorporated into a regularly formed body of believers in the true God, obeying, serving, and worshipping him according to his known will; and

yet more conspicuously, when they were planted in the land of Canaan and spread over it, presenting to view many congregations of religious persons, spiritually united in one general community. The unity thereof was sufficiently guarded by the unity of the tabernacle, and afterwards of the temple in 'the place, which God had chosen to put his name there.' At the same time, there were doubtless many synagogues scattered over the whole country, somewhat in the nature of our parish churches, wherein the several congregations met to celebrate divine worship and receive religious instruction. The Jewish church still more completely answered to this symbol, on the return from the Babylonian captivity, when in almost all cities, towns, and populous villages, synagogues were erected and numerous congregations assembled, professing the belief, service, and worship of the true God, reading, teaching, preaching, and hearing his holy word; and that not within the narrow bounds of Palestine only, but through almost every part of the civilized world. But doubtless the real, proper, perfect antitype of the Candlestick is to be found in the Christian church, when the gospel was published and its light diffused among all the nations of the world, illuminating its dark corners with the knowledge of truth and salvation.'

As to the *material* of this remarkable fabric, it is described to be of pure gold in all its parts and appendages; and in the vision of Zechariah the oil by which its light was supplied is termed 'golden oil,' from its perfectly pure consistency, which resembled it to liquid gold. Now it is well known that gold is the most beautiful and precious of all metals, and no one needs to be reminded of the happy adaptation of this substance to represent the church, that object which of all others that the earth contains, is beyond comparison the most excellent, precious, and glorious in the sight of

God, whose judgment is according to truth.

It only remains to account for the stock and branches being wrought in such exquisite resemblance to the leading parts of the almond-tree, from which the model of its fruits and flowers appears to have been derived. The mention of the almond-tree is not of infrequent occurrence in the Scriptures, and it would seem, from its peculiar physical properties, to be well adapted to stand among moral emblems as symbolical of that *spiritual prosperity, thrift, vigor, and early productiveness*, which we naturally associate with our ideas of the operations of divine principles in the souls of the righteous. Its Hebrew name שָׁקֵד *shak'ed* comes from שָׁקַד *shakad*, to make haste, to be in a hurry, and thence especially to awake early, to be vigilant, to watch. The almond-tree therefore is called שָׁקֵד *shak'ed*, 'quia prima inter arbores evigilat,' because it awakes before all other trees from its winter's repose. In southern climates it flowers often in the month of January, and by March brings its fruit to maturity. Such a tree, of which it is said Eccl. 12. 5, 'the almond-tree shall flourish,' naturally forms a very suitable emblem of the vigorous vitality of the people of God, who are like 'a tree planted by the rivers of waters, which bringeth forth his fruit in his season, and his leaf doth not fade.' We do not indeed find it any where expressly affirmed that such is the designed import of figures and illustrations drawn from this member of the vegetable kingdom, but we do find it introduced into the sacred things for some reason or other, and this reason we are doubtless left to deduce from the intrinsic adaptedness of its properties to the end in view. Thus we are told, Num. 17. 6—8, that 'Moses spake unto the children of Israel, and every one of their princes gave him a rod apiece, for each prince one, accord-

ing to their fathers' house, even twelve rods: and the rod of Aaron was among their rods. And Moses laid up the rods before the Lord in the tabernacle of witness. And it came to pass, that on the morrow Moses went into the tabernacle of witness; and behold, the rod of Aaron for the house of Levi was budded, and brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds.' By this was shadowed forth the fact, that the priestly office, in the fruits and flowers of its functions, should bloom and flourish in the family of Aaron; and we have here only to transfer the essential significancy of the symbol to the body of Christians to see its applicability to the work of the golden Candlestick. But waving all attempts to account with assurance for the employment of the almond-tree rather than any other in this relation, the main fact remains indisputable, that blossoms, flowers, and fruits were wrought into the ornamental work of the branches, and that a symbolical intention governed this part of the workmanship. Now we have seen that the Candlestick, in its New Testament bearings, represents the Churches of Christ. But the churches are composed of Christians, and Christians are a flower-decked and fruit-bearing people. They are distinguished by the beautifying graces of the Holy Spirit, fitly represented by flowers, and by the substantial fruits of holy living. 'Every branch in me that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.' A multitude of passages will at once occur to the reader, in which comparisons drawn from plants are made use of in order to portray more vividly the leading attributes of the Christian character. Why then should not a similar device, addressed to the eye, have been inwrought into the structure of a symbol expressly designed to adumbrate the churches of the saints? Is it a mere work of fancy to recognise a meaning worthy

35 And *there shall be* a knop under two branches of the same, and a knop under two branches of the same, and a knop under two branches of the same, according to the six branches that proceed out of the candlestick.

36 Their knops and their branches

of the subject and worthy of its divine Author in the unique decoration of this remarkable portion of the Mosaic apparatus? It was, at any rate, a view of the subject which commended itself to the gifted mind of Edwards, who thus comments upon the passage before us; 'The Candlestick was like a tree of many branches, and bearing flowers and fruit, agreeable to the very frequent representations of the church by a tree, an *olive-tree*, a *vine*, a *grain of mustard-seed that becomes a tree*, the *branch of the Lord*, a *tree whose substance is in it*, &c. The continuance and propagation of the church is compared to the propagation of branches from a common stock and root, and of plants from the seed. In this Candlestick, every flower is attended with a knop, apple, or pomegranate, representing a good profession attended with corresponding fruit in the true saints. Here were rows of knops and flowers one after another, beautifully representing the saints' progress of religious attainments, their going from strength to strength. Such is the nature of true grace and holy fruit, that it bears flowers that promise a further degree of fruit, the flowers having in it the principles of new fruit, and by this progress in holiness, the saint comes to shine as a light in the world.' *Notes on the Bible*, p. 265. For a still further confirmation of the truth of this solution, see Notes on Ex. 28. 33—35, respecting the pomegranates and bells on the robe of the ephod of the high priest.—We now resume the thread of our annotations.

shall be of the same: all of it *shall be* one beaten work of pure gold.

37 And thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof: and y they shall light the lamps thereof, that they may z give light over against it.

y ch. 26. 21. & 30. 8. Lev. 24. 3, 4. 3 Chron. 13. 11. z Numb. 8. 2.

35. *A knop under two branches, &c.* From this being thrice repeated it would seem to import that, beginning from the bottom pair of branches, there was to be on the main shaft one knop under each pair, near where it branched out, which would leave one knop with its bowl and flower to ornament the upper part of the shaft, between the upper pair of branches and the middle lamp.

36. *Shall be of the same.* That is, of the same material; all pure solid gold.

37. *Thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof.* Shalt cause to be made. By 'lamps' here is meant the *lamp-sconces* or *receptacles* for holding the oil, attached to the upper extremity of the shaft and each of the branches. This is rendered in the Gr. by *λυχνοι*, *lamps*. —† *And they shall light, &c.* Heb. העלה *healah*, *he shall cause to ascend*; i. e. he, the priest; whose duty it was to attend the Candlestick. Yet the phrase is collective implying the succession of priests, and therefore properly enough rendered in the plural in our translation. The rendering 'shall light' is rather a paraphrase than a literal version. The meaning of the original will be plain if we bear in mind that the 'lamps' or *sconces* were to be detached and taken down from their sockets in the top of the Candlestick. When they were cleaned, filled with oil, and lighted, they were to be *put up* again in their places, and this is the exact sense of the Heb. העלה *to make to ascend*, i. e. *to raise, to elevate*. Gr. επιθησεις τους λυχνους, *thou shalt put on the lamps*. So also the Vulg. 'Thou



38 And the tongs thereof, and the snuff-dishes thereof, *shall be of pure gold.*

39 *Of a talent of pure gold shall he make it, with all these vessels.*

shalt set them upon the Candlestick.' As the lamps were thus *put up* in a *lighted* state, it is easy to see how the term came to be rendered by the verb *to light*. When the lamps were all lighted below, and duly *raised up* to their proper places, the Candlestick might be said to be lighted.—¶ *Give light over against it.* Heb. עַל עֵבֶר *al iber pan'ha*, over against the face thereof; i. e. right forward, or straight before it, as the phrase signifies Ezek. 1. 9, 12. As the Candlestick stood near the wall on the south side of the Holy Place, its light would naturally fall in the opposite direction, more especially upon the Table of Shewbread, which faced it on the north. Comp. Num. 8. 2, 3.

38. *The tongs thereof.* Heb. מִלְקָחֶיהָ *malkah'ha*, literally *takers* from לָקַח *lakah*, to take, to receive; supposed to be a kind of *scissars* or *snuffers* for trimming the lamps. Chal. 'Forceps.'—

¶ *Snuff-dishes thereof.* Heb. מַחְתֹּתֶיהָ *mahtoth'ha*, probably a kind of vessels or pans for receiving the snuffings of the lamps after they had been cut off by the 'tongs' above mentioned. Their precise form cannot now be determined.

39. *A talent of pure gold, &c.* That is, a talent of gold in weight was used in making the Candlestick, and the different vessels and instruments belonging to it; and this according to the most approved estimates of the value of Jewish coins amounted to not less than \$30,000.

40. *Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was shewed thee, &c.* Heb. מֵרָאָה אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּה *asher attah mor'eh*, which thou wast caused to see. The command here given to Moses, enjoining upon him a scrupulous adher-

40 And a look that thou make *them* after their pattern, which was shewed thee in the mount.

a ch. 26. 30. Numb. 8. 4. 1 Chron. 28. 11, 19 Acts 7. 44. Hebr. 8. 5.

ence to the model proposed, undoubtedly carries with it an intimation that God regards his own appointments in matters of worship as of the utmost importance, and at the same time of a tendency in man to vary from his patterns and trust to his own inventions. Probably some more latitude is allowed under the Christian dispensation to the dictates of human wisdom in regard to externals, provided certain great fundamental *principles* be adhered to, and no onerous impositions be laid upon the conscience; but the Tabernacle service was throughout a system of *instituted worship*, which derived all its authority from the express appointment of Jehovah. On this account it was manifestly proper that every item of the apparatus should be fashioned according to the model set before Moses on the mount. It is to be observed, therefore, that this order was given to him *repeatedly*, and with very peculiar force and emphasis; and his strict adherence to it is, in the last chapter in this book, noticed no less than eight times, once after the mention of every separate piece of furniture that was made. In the New Testament also his compliance with the command is repeatedly adverted to, and the very order itself expressly quoted, Acts, 7. 4, Heb. 8. 5. What then was the reason of such minute particularity? Why must such and such things only be made, and they too of such precise materials and shape? Undoubtedly because the whole was intended to be of a *typical* character, shadowing the leading features of the gospel dispensation. Now as none but God could know all the things that were to be prefigured, so none but he could know how to adjust and designate them in the way

## CHAPTER XXVI.

**M**OREOVER, a thou shalt make the tabernacle *with* ten cur-

a ch. 36. 8.

best adapted to their end. Had Moses been left to contrive any thing from his own ingenuity, there might have wanted a correspondence between the type and the antitype. But when a model of every thing was shown him by God himself, the whole must of necessity accord most perfectly with the mind and purpose of the divine Designer.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

## THE CURTAINS OF THE TABERNACLE.

1. *Thou shalt make the tabernacle with ten curtains, &c.* Heb. **הַמִּשְׁכָּן** *hammishkan*, the habitation. It will be observed, that as nothing is said of the frame-work of wood till we arrive at the 15th verse, and yet the term 'tabernacle' is here employed, the original **מִשְׁכָּן** *mishkan* must be understood in somewhat of a restricted sense as denoting the *inner set of curtains*. From this is distinguished the second or goats' hair set, expressly called **אוֹהֶל** *ohel*, a tent, and from both, the other two which are called simply by the more general term **מִכְסֵה** *mikseh*, covering. There is no doubt that the two first of these terms **מִשְׁכָּן** *mishkan* and **אוֹהֶל** *ohel* elsewhere occur as a designation of the *whole tabernacle* without special reference to its several parts, yet it is always important to notice the minutest shades of peculiarity in the use of Scriptural terms; and we shall see as we proceed, that the distinction now adverted to is amply supported. See Note on Ex. 40. 19. The ten curtains which the sacred writer goes on to describe did not, as we have remarked above, form the whole envelope of the Tabernacle, but simply one set, of which there were four in all. Of these the inner set, here described, was by far the richest and

tains of fine twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet: *with* cherubims of cunning work shalt thou make them.

most exquisite. They were made of the finest linen, dyed of the most beautiful colors, blue, purple, and scarlet, and curiously embroidered all over with Cherubim, as if it were intended to intimate that the beings which they represented were vitally interested in the great truths shadowed forth by the most recondite and central mysteries of the Tabernacle. This is evidently a relation too intimate to be sustained by angels, and therefore we are to look to men, men redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, for the substance of the symbol. But as the symbol points more especially to men in their saved and glorified state, there is less impropriety in giving them an angelic emblem, because they will then be raised to an angelic condition. Our Savior's words, Mark, 12. 25, 'They shall be as the angels in heaven,' we have no doubt when rightly understood go rather to *identify* than to *assimilate* the sons of the resurrection with the angels of heaven. — **¶** *Fine twined linen*; by which is meant linen made of threads *finely twisted* in the process of spinning. Hence in the Hebrew canons it is said, 'Wheresoever fine linen twisted is spoken of in the law, it must be six-double thread.' It is conjectured that this is the reason why this exquisite kind of linen, the Byss, is called **שֶׁשׁ** *shesh* in the original, which properly signifies 'six.' — **¶** *Cherubims of cunning work*. Heb. **מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֶׁב** *maaseh hoshëb*, the work of an exquisite craftsman. Gr. *εργασία υφαντου*, with the work of a weaver. Chal. 'With the work of the artificer.' Arab. 'A picture of the most sagacious art.' Vulg. 'Variegated with embroidered work.' The meaning is, that figures of the Cherubim were to be embroidered into the tapestry of which the linen

2 The length of one curtain *shall be* eight and twenty cubits, and the breadth of one curtain four cubits: and every one of the curtains shall have one measure.

3 The five curtains shall be coupled together one to another; and

curtains were composed. Considering that the inner set of curtains here described was ornamented *throughout* with this splendid coloring and embroidery, we are on the whole strongly inclined to adopt the opinion of Bähr (*Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, p. 64.), that no part of it hung on the *outside* of the structure, but that it served as an *interior lining* to both the outer and inner rooms of the Tabernacle. To say nothing of the fact that otherwise it is not easy to conceive why the linen curtains were not as much an אהל or *tent* as the goats' hair, it follows from the ordinary interpretation, that all that part of the beautiful embroidered work which fell outside of the walls was entirely concealed from view; that is to say, that out of 1120 square cubits of this exquisitely wrought tapestry, only 300, or the portion over-head were visible, leaving 820, or about three-fourths of the whole, entirely excluded from the eye, either within or without, except when the Tabernacle was taken down or set up; and then they would be exposed to the general gaze, which was equally abhorrent to the sacredness of their design. It may then be safely asked, whether this is probable? Would infinite wisdom have authorised such a superfluous expense of workmanship, such a prodigal waste of splendid imagery? Suppose this curtain-work, on the other hand, to be wholly suspended *within* the rooms, and the whole of the embroidery was or might be visible. And in accordance with this, we find that in the Temple, which was modelled after the Tabernacle, the figures of the Cherubim were carved on the in-

other five curtains *shall be* coupled one to another.

4 And thou shalt make loops of blue upon the edge of the one curtain from the selvedge in the coupling; and likewise shalt thou make in the uttermost edge of *another*

*side walls* all round about the Holy and Most Holy Place, 1 Kings, 6. 29. It is true indeed that this view of the subject requires us to suppose that these curtains were attached by some kind of fastenings to the upper extremity of the boards, after passing across and forming the roof; but as the separating vail, v. 32, was suspended from the pillars by means of hooks and loops, so nothing is easier than to imagine that a similar expedient was adopted here. The more the matter is considered, the more probable we think will this suggestion appear; although we have in the figure below represented the inner set of curtains as hanging without; but this is simply with a view to display the difference of their texture from that of the others.

2, 3. *The length of one curtain shall be eight and twenty cubits, &c.* That is, about fourteen yards in breadth, and two in width. These ten curtains were to be formed into two separate hangings, five breadths in each, which were probably sewed together, while the two hangings were coupled by loops and golden clasps. With one of these large and gorgeous pieces of tapestry the Holy Place was covered, with whose dimensions it very exactly corresponded, and with the other the Most Holy. This was doubtless the reason of the twofold division. But as the Most Holy Place was only five yards long, there remained a surplus of five yards, which hung down on the west end of that room, being just sufficient to cover it.

4. *And thou shalt make loops of blue.* That is, of blue tape. These loops did not themselves interlace with each

curtain, in the coupling of the second.

5 Fifty loops shalt thou make in the one curtain, and fifty loops shalt thou make in the edge of the curtain that *is* in the coupling of the second; that the loops may take hold one of another.

6 And thou shalt make fifty taches of gold, and couple the curtains together with the taches: and it shall be one tabernacle.

7 ¶ And <sup>b</sup>thou shalt make curtains of goats' hair to be a covering upon the tabernacle: eleven curtains shalt thou make.

8 The length of one curtain *shall*

<sup>b</sup> ch. 36. 14.

other, and thus connect the curtains, but they were brought near together and then coupled by the 'taches' or *clasps*. As to the precise manner in which this coupling was effected we are thrown upon our own conjectures. Horsley's account of it is as follows, (Bibl. Crit. vol. 1. p. 103): 'Since the two sheets were fastened together, whenever the Tabernacle was set up by the loops and the hooks, and there were fifty hooks upon each sheet, but only fifty hooks in all, it is obvious that one hook must have served each pair of loops. And this is remarked by all commentators. But how this was effected, I have nowhere found explained in an intelligible manner. I think it must have been thus. The fifty hooks were all set upon one sheet. Each hook was set immediately behind a loop. Then the loop immediately before the hook was passed through the opposite loop on the other sheet, and being drawn back, was hitched upon the hook behind it. Thus the edge of the sheet on which the hooks were not set, would be made to lap a little over the edge of the other, and a close, firm, neat joining would be formed.' The coupling of the two main hangings together in this

be thirty cubits, and the breadth of one curtain four cubits: and the eleven curtains *shall be all of one measure*.

9 And thou shalt couple five curtains by themselves, and six curtains by themselves, and shalt double the sixth curtain in the forefront of the tabernacle.

10 And thou shalt make fifty loops on the edge of the one curtain *that is* outmost in the coupling, and fifty loops in the edge of the curtain which coupleth the second.

11 And thou shalt make fifty taches of brass, and put the taches into the loops, and couple the tent together, that it may be one.

manner made it, as it were, 'one tabernacle' (משכן), i. e. one continuous awning or pavilion. It was such, moreover, or rather is spoken of as such, independent of the wood work, which is subsequently mentioned.

7—11. *Curtains of goats' hair*. The nature of this material, as a coarse kind of *camlet*, we have already considered, ch. 25. 4. The curtains made of it were designed as a protection to the finer fabric of the inner set, which seems to be more especially alluded to in the term 'tabernacle'—a sense confirmed by the usage of the Heb. משכן before remarked upon. There was one more piece of this camlet covering than of the linen, and it was also two cubits, or a yard, longer. The breadth of each piece was the same as that of the former, but as there was one more of the camlet than of the linen, it made the whole covering when coupled together two yards longer and one yard broader than the interior one. For this reason, it hung down near to the bottom of the side-walls, and one yard in front over the entrance, which part of it was ordinarily doubled back. The coupling of the parts was managed in the same way as that of the other, except that

12 And the remnant that remaineth of the curtains of the tent, the half curtain that remaineth, shall hang over the back-side of the tabernacle.

13 And a cubit on the one side, and a cubit on the other side of that which remaineth in the length of the curtains of the tent, it shall

hang over the sides of the tabernacle on this side and on that side, to cover it.

14 And thou shalt make a covering for the tent of rams' skins dyed red, and a covering above of badgers' skins.

c ch. 36. 19.

one division consisted of five pieces and the other six, and in this instance the taches were of brass instead of gold.—

¶ *Couple the tent together.* Heb. וְקָשְׁתָּ *ohel*. This phraseology keeps up the distinction adverted to above between 'tabernacle' and 'tent' in this part of the history.

13. *The remnant that remaineth, &c.* The disposal of this surplus part of the curtains has been already intimated above. From the additional particulars here given, we learn, that it went to furnish the greater length of hanging on the sides, the front, and the west end of the Tabernacle. Still it did not depend quite to the ground, but left the foundation work of silver sockets exposed to view.

14. *Thou shalt make a covering, &c.* Of the third and fourth of these invelopes, which were made of skins, as they were of a still coarser fabric, the account is very brief. Nothing is said of the dimensions of either, but it is to be presumed that each was somewhat larger than the one immediately next it, and to which it served as a 'covering.' It is not expressly stated whether the curtains lay flat or sloping on the top of the Tabernacle; if flat, there was more need of so many distinct coverings to prevent the rain from soaking through and injuring the inner and finer set, or from dropping into the sanctuary. It is probable, however, that the successive layers would of themselves sufficiently round the top of the Tabernacle to carry off the water, of which but little would be expected to fall in

that arid region. It may also be supposed that in good weather, and on more solemn occasions, the exterior and coarser hangings were folded up on the sides so as to let the inner and finer appear in all their beauty; and as it is certain that neither of the inner hangings came lower than to the upper side of the silver ground-sill, that splendid foundation would be thus exposed to view, and the whole together would present to the eye of the beholder a magnificent spectacle. In bad weather, or at night, the skin-coverings were probably let down to their full length, which was sufficient to cover the silver sleepers, and thus protect them from rain or snow. The remark of Scott on the typical design of the several curtain-layers is very appropriate; 'The whole represents the person and doctrine of Christ, his true church, and all heavenly things; which are outwardly, and to the carnal eyed, mean, but are inwardly and in the sight of God, exceedingly glorious and precious. The secure protection which he prepares for those who are inwardly precious in his sight, may also be denoted; and the unity of the whole, formed of so many pieces and of such different materials, into one covering of the sanctuary, represents the spiritual temple formed of persons of different nations, dispositions, abilities, and attainments, compacted together into one church, by the uniting influence of the spirit of love.' The annexed cut is a probable approximation to a correct view of the curtains.


15 ¶ And thou shalt make boards for the tabernacle of shittim-wood standing up.

16 Ten cubits *shall be* the length of a board, and a cubit and a half *shall be* the breadth of one board.

17 Two tenons *shall there be* in

one board, set in order one against another: thus shalt thou make for all the boards of the tabernacle.

18 And thou shalt make the boards for the tabernacle, twenty boards on the south side southward.



THE CURTAINS OF THE TABERNACLE.

#### THE BOARDS.

15. *Thou shalt make boards, &c.* Heb. קרשים *kerashim*, boards or planks. The appropriate root קרש *karash* does not occur in Hebrew, but in Chaldee the verb signifies to *coagulate, congeal, condense*, as קרס *keres* likewise does in Arabic, and the Syriac uses קרשא *karsha* as a noun for *contignation, or coupling together*. The radical idea of the Heb. קרש *karash* seems to be to *compact, contignate, or fasten together*, as in the frame-work of a building. Such a frame-work was necessary to support the curtains, and to give more stability to the sacred tent. Of the 'shittim-wood,' or acacia, we have already spoken; the remaining particulars will be considered as we proceed.

16. *Ten cubits shall be the length of a board.* As the length of the boards constituted the height of the Tabernacle, it follows from this, according to the common computation of the cubit, that it was five yards or fifteen feet high. As there were twenty of these on each side, each of which were a cubit and a half, or twenty-seven inches

in breadth, it made the whole length thirty cubits, or fifteen yards. Nothing, however, is said of the thickness of the boards, which Lightfoot fixes at nine inches, and which we have every reason to believe did not fall short of that estimate, though the Rabbins make it an entire cubit. This inference is confirmed by the fact that the Sept renders the original קרשים by στύλοι *pillars*, and this they would scarcely have done had they understood it to mean only boards, which would certainly be a very inadequate material for such a structure.

17. *Two tenons.* Heb. ידות *yadoth*, hands; so called probably from their *holding fast* in the sockets into which they were mortised. These 'tenons' are generally understood to have been affixed to the bottom of each board, and to have been precisely the same with those mentioned below, v. 19. But we are rather of opinion that the two tenons here spoken of projected from the *side* of each board, and were inserted into corresponding receptacles in the adjoining board, in order to give more com-

19 And thou shalt make forty sockets of silver under the twenty boards: two sockets under one board for his two tenons, and two sockets under another board for his two tenons.

20 And for the second side of the


pactness to the wall. With this substantially agrees the rendering of the Vulg. 'In the sides of the boards shall be made two mortises, whereby one board may be joined to another board.' The original for 'set in order' (משלבת *meshallaboth*) properly signifies 'set ladderwise,' and it is perfectly easy to conceive that where two boards were brought near together, and yet not quite closed up, the connecting tenons would

tabernacle on the north side *there shall be* twenty boards.

21 And their forty sockets of silver; two sockets under one board, and two sockets under another board.

22 And for the sides of the tab-

look like the rounds of a ladder. The tenons at the bottom of each board we suppose to have been additional to these. Still it must be admitted that this interpretation is not quite certain. The matter is left to the judgment of the reader. The annexed cut may be considered as a probable approximation to a correct idea of the position of the boards, tenons, and sockets. The different parts will be readily distinguished.



BOARDS AND SOCKETS.

19. *Forty sockets of silver.* Heb. אֲדָנִי כֶסֶף *adnë keseph*, bases of silver; implying doubtless the supporting sockets of the tenons, as the true import of אֵדֶן *eden* is a base or supporter. Each of these sockets was composed of a talent of silver, and every two of them joined together equalled in length the width of one of the planks, and so formed, when united, one entire foundation, which, in the technical language of the architects, may be termed a silver ground-sill.

20, 21. *And for the second side, &c* These two verses amount to nothing more than a direction, that the construction of the north side of the Tabernacle should exactly correspond with that of the south.

22. *For the sides of the tabernacle westward.* Heb. יַרְכוֹת *yarkoth*. This term when applied to things inanimate usually denotes an end, a term, an extremity, and is doubtless so to be understood here, as we find it occasionally rendered in the Gr. ἄκρᾱ, *extreme*

ernacle westward thou shalt make six boards.

23 And two boards shalt thou make for the corners of the tabernacle in the two sides.

24 And they shall be coupled together beneath, and they shall be coupled together above the head of it unto one ring: thus shall it be for them both; they shall be for the two corners.

25 And they shall be eight boards, and their sockets of silver, sixteen sockets; two sockets under one board, and two sockets under another board.

26 ¶ And thou shalt make bars

*parts.* The idiomatic plural term 'sides' therefore is here equivalent to 'end.' So it is distinctly interpreted both in the Targum of Onkelos and Jonathan.

23, 24. *Two boards shalt thou make for the corners.* These two verses are involved in an obscurity which we have endeavored in vain to penetrate. The reader must be thrown upon his own resources to imagine such a construction of the corners as the general plan and objects of the building would admit or require. The original word for 'coupled' literally signifies 'twinning' or 'made like twins,' i. e. exactly alike; but beyond this we are unable to afford him any light. Should he obtain it from other commentators, he will be more fortunate than ourselves. Our inability, however, to make out satisfactorily this part of the structure detracts nothing from the accuracy of the explanations of the rest.

25. *They shall be eight boards.* The two corner boards being added to the six others made up the complement of eight.

26. *Thou shalt make bars.* The south and north sides, and the west end of the Tabernacle had five gold-covered bars, each of which were carried through rings or staples of gold, but what the

of shittim-wood; five for the boards of the one side of the tabernacle,

27 And five bars for the boards of the other side of the tabernacle, and five bars for the boards of the sides of the tabernacle, for the two sides westward.

28 And the middle bar in the midst of the boards shall reach from end to end.

29 And thou shalt overlay the boards with gold, and make their rings of gold for places for the bars, and thou shalt overlay the bars with gold.

30 And thou shalt rear up the tab-

length of these bars was, is not said. The middle ones, indeed, on the different sides and end, were appointed to be of the whole length, or thirty cubits on the north and south sides, and ten cubits at the west end; which was probably sunk into the boards, and ran along a groove from end to end, at five cubits from the ground. The other four bars, which Josephus says were each five cubits long, were perhaps variously disposed on the sides and end of the structure in such a way as to conduce at once most effectually to its beauty and strength. Having no certain information as to the precise manner in which the four were disposed along the sides we have represented them in our cut as arranged uniformly with the middle one. It is obviously a matter of little importance. In the phrase, 'for the two sides westward,' the plural is probably put for the singular, as it was the end in which the two sides terminated.

29. *Thou shalt overlay the boards with gold.* We are thrown upon our own conjectures as to the thickness of the metal by which the boards and bars were overlaid. If it were done with gold plates, they must have been extremely thin, as otherwise the weight would have been altogether too great to



ernacle <sup>d</sup> according to the fashion thereof which was shewed thee in the mount.

31 ¶ And <sup>e</sup> thou shalt make a rail of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen of cun-

<sup>d</sup> ch. 25. 9, 40. & 27. 8. Acts 7. 44. Heb. 8. 5. <sup>e</sup> ch. 36. 35. Lev. 16. 2. 2 Chron. 3. 14. Matt. 27. 51. Hebr. 9. 3.

allow of their having been carried but with the utmost difficulty. We presume, therefore, that they were rather *gilded* than *plated*. Such a thin coating would no doubt have been liable to be easily worn off, but it could as easily be repaired.

#### THE PARTITION-VAIL.

31. *Thou shalt make a rail, &c.* Heb.

פרכת *paroketh*. Gr. καταπετασμα, *a rail, a spreading*. The etymology of the original term is doubtful, though we find in the Chaldee פרך *perak*, to break, rend apart, forcibly separate, and פרכת according to Parkhurst is applied to the inner Vail from its *breaking, interrupting, or dividing* between the Holy and Most Holy Place. This Vail was undoubtedly of the same material with the inner set of curtains, and figured and embroidered in the same manner. And as it constituted, when hanging down, the *lining* of one side of both the Holy and Most Holy Place, it goes somewhat, perhaps, to confirm our suggestion above relative to the position of the wrought linen curtains of the Tabernacle, as hanging *within* the edifice instead of *without*; for this would make the adorning of the whole interior uniform throughout. The Vail was to be suspended from golden hooks attached to four pillars of shittim-wood resting, like the boards, upon an equal number of silver sockets. And this, by the way, leads us to remark, that the punctuation of our English Bibles conveys an idea entirely erroneous, viz., that the hooks were to be placed upon the silver sockets. But these sockets

ning work: with cherubims shall it be made.

32 And thou shalt hang it upon four pillars of shittim-wood overlaid with gold: their hooks shall be of gold upon the four sockets of silver.

33 ¶ And thou shalt hang up the

were unquestionably at the bottom of the pillars, and the clause, 'their hooks shall be of gold,' ought to be inclosed in a parenthesis, as it is in the old Geneva version; 'And thou shalt hang it upon four pillars of shittim-wood covered with gold (whose hooks shall be of gold), standing upon four sockets of silver.' It was the pillars and not the hooks that stood upon the silver sockets.

33. *Shalt hang up the vail under the taches*. That is, under the golden clasps that connected the two larger hangings of the inner curtain, spoken of above, v. 6. These were joined just over the dividing line between the two rooms of the Tabernacle, so that this separating vail hung exactly under the taches or clasps. It does not appear from any express passage of Scripture, in what proportions the interior of the Tabernacle was divided. But as Solomon's Temple, of sixty cubits in length, was divided into two parts of forty and twenty, so it is highly probable that the thirty cubits in length of the Tabernacle was divided into similar proportions of twenty cubits for the Holy, and ten for the Most Holy Place, making the latter a perfect cube of ten cubits every way. This accounts, as we have before intimated, for the remarkable feature in the description of the heavenly city, mentioned Rev. 21. 16, to wit, that *it lay four square*, the length, breadth, and height of it being equal. This was because it answered to its type the Holy of Holies. In the Holy Place, into which none but the priests were allowed to enter, were stationed

vail under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the <sup>f</sup>vail the ark of the testimony: and the <sup>g</sup>vail shall divide unto you between the holy *place* and the most holy.

34 And <sup>h</sup>thou shalt put the mer-

<sup>f</sup> ch. 25. 16. & 40. 21. <sup>g</sup> Lev. 16. 2. Hebr. 9. 2, 3. <sup>h</sup> ch. 25. 21. & 40. 20. Hebr. 9. 5.

the Candlestick, the Table of Shewbread, and the Altar of Incense. In the Most Holy, into which none but the High Priest could enter, and he but once a year, was deposited only the Ark of the Covenant or Testimony, with its surmounting Mercy-seat.

The special design of this Vail was to debar the people from entering, or even looking, into the Most Holy Place, or place of the Ark, and the reason of this rigid exclusion acquaints us at once with the general mystical import of Vail, as a part of the apparatus of the Tabernacle. On this point we have happily the apostle Paul as the *angelus interpretes*. Heb. 9. 6—9, 'Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle (the first or outer room), accomplishing the service of God: but into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present.' In other words, the way into the true heaven, of which the inner sanctuary was a type, was not laid open under the old economy, or by means of any of its services, but remained to be opened by Christ, of whom it is said, v. 24, that he 'is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.'

cy-seat upon the ark of the testimony in the most holy *place*.

35 And <sup>i</sup>thou shalt set the table without the vail, and <sup>k</sup>the candlestick over against the table on the side of the tabernacle toward the south: and thou shalt put the table on the north side.

<sup>i</sup> ch. 40. 22. Hebr. 9. 2. <sup>k</sup> ch. 40. 24.

But this does not yet exhaust the pregnant import of the Mosaic symbols. Still farther light is thrown upon it, Heb. 10. 19, 20, 'Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, let us draw near.' Here it is clear that the Vail is represented as in some way shadowing forth the *flesh* or *body* of Christ, although it is perhaps at first view difficult to avoid an impression of incongruity in the imagery. What is Christ's *flesh* or *body* but *himself*? And how can he be described as the *person entering*, and yet *he himself* the *medium* through which the entrance is made? But a right view of the glorious constitution of Christ's person as God-man Mediator, and of the prominent place which he holds as the soul and centre and substance of nearly *every part* of the typical economy, will afford a clue to the solution of the problem. We have previously shown, if we mistake not, in our remarks upon the Cloudy Pillar, and upon the Shekinah in general, that that splendid symbol pointed directly to Christ as the central mystery which it involved. As the sombre folds of the guiding Cloud in the wilderness enshrouded the Glory of Jehovah, except when occasional displays of it were made, so the human nature or body of Christ, while he *tabernacled* on earth, served as a kind of temporary *envelope* or *vail* of the divine nature which dwelt within. This mystic *cloud* or *vail* of

36 And <sup>1</sup>thou shalt make an hanging for the door of the tent, of blue,

<sup>1</sup> ch. 36. 37.

his flesh we suppose to have been transiently rent or cloven at his transfiguration, and a momentary display made of the indwelling glory of his Godhead. But this was not designed to be permanent; it was only an evanescent gleam vouchsafed to the outward senses, for the greater inward assurance, of his select disciples, in respect to the essential dignity and divinity of his character, and to connect his person not only with the *truth* of the ancient visible Shekinah, but also with that future foretold *theophany*, which is to constitute the beatific vision in heaven. It was only at his death, when his 'body was broken' for the sins of the world, that this intervening cloud or vail was entirely rent, dissolved, and done away, and a way thus opened for the free manifestation of his glory and majesty to all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles. Now it is well known that after the Cloudy Pillar was removed from the sight of Israel, subsequent to the rearing of the Tabernacle, and the indwelling Shekinah had taken up its abode in the Holy of Holies, the separating Vail served to conceal the supernatural Brightness from the view, just as the dark mass of the Cloud had done prior to that event. Consequently as the Vail of the Tabernacle was to the inner abiding Glory what the Savior's flesh was to his indwelling Divinity, it was ordered that at the same time that the vail of his flesh was rent upon the cross, the corresponding Vail of the Temple was 'rent in twain from the top to the bottom,' implying that a blessed way of access was now provided into the interior of the heavenly sanctuary, of which the grand characteristic is, that it is to have 'the Glory of God,' and from thence to receive its denomination, 'Jehovah-Shammah,' *the Lord is there*. The truth is, that Christ sus-

and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, wrought with needle-work.

tains so many offices in the plan of redemption, and he is presented to us in the ancient symbols in such a manifold variety of aspects, that we are not to be surprised if we should find in the apostolic explanations a blending of import that even approximates to something like confusion. Who can doubt that in the priestly service the High Priest himself, the Sacrifice, and the Altar, all found their substance in Christ? In like manner, may not the Vail and the inner Presence both point also to him?

#### THE ENTRANCE-VAIL.

36. *Thou shalt make an hanging for the door.* Heb. מִסָּךְ *masak*, from סָכַךְ *sakak*, to overspread, to cover, denoting in general *tegumentum*, *operimentum*, a covering, any thing spread over; but here applied to the vail or curtain which hung over the entrance to the Tabernacle, and formed its outer-door. Oriental usages still furnish something analogous to this. 'We passed Lahar,' says Morier, 'close to a small valley, where we found several snug encampments of the Eelauts, at one of which we stopped to examine the tent of the chief of the *obah*, or family. It was composed of a wooden frame of circular laths, which were fixed on the ground, and then covered over with large felts, that were fastened down by a cord, ornamented by tassels of various colors. A curtain, curiously worked by the women, with coarse needle-work of various colors, was suspended over the door. In the king of Persia's tents, magnificent *perdahs*, or hangings of needle-work, are suspended, as well as on the doors of the great mosques in Turkey.' This Vail was suspended on five pillars, overlaid with gold, at the east end of the sanctuary; and though of the same

37 And thou shalt make for the hanging <sup>m</sup>five pillars of shittim-wood, and overlay them with gold,

<sup>m</sup> ch. 36. 38.

rich material with the inner Vail, yet it seems to have been less highly ornamented, as the Jewish writers affirm that there was a difference between the work of the 'cunning workman' mentioned v. 1, and that of the 'embroiderer' mentioned here, which consisted in this; that in the former, the figures were so wrought, perhaps in weaving, that they might be seen on both sides of the work; but in the latter, being wrought by needle-work, they were only visible on one side. Accordingly, while the Cherubic figure was wrought in one, we find no intimation of it in the other. As it was solely by raising or turning aside this Vail, that the priest entered the Tabernacle, it is obvious that the term 'door' in our translation is not to be taken in its ordinary sense, nor is the original strictly equivalent to 'thou shalt make a hanging as a door for the tent;' for the Heb. פֶּתַח *pethah*, as remarked in the Note on Gen. 19. 6, signifies properly the *open space* or *passage-way* which is usually closed by the *door*, and the meaning here is simply, 'thou shalt make a hanging for the entrance-way.' 'This is the more material,' says Wells (Introduction to Paraphrase, p. 47), 'to be taken notice of, because the said rendering of the Hebrew word by a *door*, not only gives the reader a wrong notion of the entrance itself into the Tabernacle, but also thereby hinders him from having a clear perception of the reason of several rites and expressions referring to the said entrance of the Tabernacle. For instance, what was done at the entrance of the Tabernacle, is expressly said in many places of Scripture to be done 'before the Lord,' as Ex. 29. 11—42. Lev. 1. 3, &c. Insomuch, that where a thing is said to be done only 'before

and their hooks shall be of gold: and thou shalt cast five sockets of brass for them.

the Lord,' thereby expositors understand it generally of its being done *at the entrance of the Tabernacle* or the like, justly looking on these expressions as equivalent generally in Scripture, because they are often so joined together as one and the same thing. Now the reason, why these two expressions came to be thus equivalent I take to be this. It was looked on as a piece of state and majesty by the eastern princes, seldom to vouchsafe the honor of coming near to their presence to any but their great courtiers; and when they were pleased to vouchsafe the great honor of coming into their presence or before them to any others on special and extraordinary occasions, they themselves were wont then to sit on their thrones, which was covered with a canopy over it, and encompassed all round with fine curtains; not drawn quite close, but so as that they could see easily those that were admitted thus into their presence, through the small spaces left between the curtains; but the others could have but a small, if any, glimpse, of their majesties or the inside of the thrones they sat on. Agreeably hereto the whole Tabernacle in this case was to be looked on as the *throne of the Divine Majesty* here on earth. And consequently when any were to be admitted to the honor of appearing more immediately *before the Lord*, he was to appear *at the entrance of the Tabernacle*, as before the throne of the Divine Majesty; from within which the Divine Majesty was conceived in a special and gracious manner to see or look on the person that so appeared before him; though the said person could not see the Divine Majesty, or have any more than perhaps a glimpse of the inside of his throne or of the

## CHAPTER XXVII.

AND thou shalt make <sup>a</sup>an altar of shittim-wood, five cubits

<sup>a</sup> ch. 38. 1. Ezek. 43. 13.

Tabernacle, by reason of the Vail hanging afore the entrance of it. And whereas it is one piece of reverence not to *turn one's back*, but to *stand with one's face*, toward any great person, especially kings; in like manner he that appeared *before the Lord*, stood *with his face toward the entrance of the Tabernacle*, as being the forepart of the throne of the Divine Majesty, and consequently by so doing he was conceived to stand with his face toward the Divine Majesty itself. But now all this agreement between the manner of appearing *before the Lord*, as it is called in Scripture, and of appearing before earthly princes, in those eastern countries, to which the former referred, is much obscured by representing the entrance into the Tabernacle as through a *door*.<sup>1</sup> Josephus informs us that besides the Vail of linen here described there was another of coarser fabric hung over the first to defend it from injuries of the weather, and that upon festival occasions this was drawn aside or rolled up that the people might see the exquisite beauty of the workmanship of the first; a suggestion which we deem altogether probable.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

## THE ALTAR OF SACRIFICE.

1. *Thou shalt make an altar.* Heb. מִזְבֵּחַ *mizbēah*. Gr. θυσιαστήριον, *sacrificatory*; both appellations being derived from a term signifying to *sacrifice*. On the general import of the term see Note on Ex. 20. 24. This altar was a sort of square chest of shittim wood overlaid with brass. It was five cubits long by five broad, and three in height (about three yards square and five feet high), and had a horn or

long, and five cubits broad; the altar shall be four square: and the height thereof *shall be* three cubits.

2 And thou shalt make the horns

projection at each corner. It was hollow within, and in the middle of its surface was a sunk grating of brass to support the fire, which was furnished with four rings, that it might be taken out and carried separately from the body of the altar. The ashes from the fire sunk through the grating, and were taken thence in a pan made for the purpose. The altar had four rings or staples at the sides, into which poles of shittim wood covered with brass were inserted when the altar was to be moved from place to place. This is the account which seems to agree best with the text, although some of the details have been differently understood by various expositors. It is thought that both this altar and the larger one made by Solomon, by which it was superseded, had the lower part of the hollow filled up either with earth or stones, in compliance with the injunction in chap. 20. 24, 25. Josephus says, that the altar used in his time at the Temple was of unhewn stone, and that no iron tool had been employed in its construction. None of the altars which the Scripture assigns to either the Tabernacle or Temple were of this construction, but that erected at Mount Ebal by Joshua was so (Josh. 8. 31), and apparently others which were set up in different parts of the land of promise.—

¶ *Thou shalt make the horns of it.* Heb. קַרְנֹת *karnoth*. Gr. κερατα. The horns of the Altar have given scope to voluminous discussion, both as regards their form and their design. They were certainly projections of some kind or other at the four corners, but their precise shape, or even the direction in which they projected, cannot be distinctly collected from the sacred text. By many it is supposed that they were

of it upon the four corners thereof: his horns shall be of the same: and <sup>b</sup>thou shalt overlay it with brass.

3 And thou shalt make his pans

<sup>b</sup> See Numb. 16. 38.

actually *horn-shaped*, and this opinion is supported by the authority of Josephus as to the Altar used in his time. But the opinion seems preferable that they were square risings, or *pinnacles*, from each corner of the Altar; or square to half their height, and terminating pyramidically in a sharp tip or point. The descriptions given by the Rabbins, and the pictures of the most ancient altars go to confirm this view of their form. We are no more certain as to the *use* of this appendage to the Altar, than as to its form. It is inferred by some from Ps. 118. 27, 'bind the sacrifice with cords to the horns of the Altar,' that these appendages were designed for the purpose of fastening the victim to the Altar before it was slain. But of this there is little probability, as the incense-altar, at which no bloody sacrifices were offered, also had horns; and there is nothing in all Jewish antiquity to favor the idea of the victims being ordinarily thus secured and slain immediately contiguous to the Altar. Of the passage just cited the best interpretation is perhaps that of Rabbi D. Kimchi, given in the following paraphrase; 'Bring the sacrifices bound with cords until (from their great number) they shall have reached even to the horns of the Altar.' The Psalmist is supposed to have commanded so large a sacrifice, that the victims should even crowd the outer court, and press up against the very Altar. The Chaldee gives a somewhat different construction; 'Tie the lamb, that is to be offered, with cords, till ye come to offer him; and sprinkle his blood upon the horns of the Altar.' Either of them, however, are preferable to the sense yielded by our translation. The prob-

ability on the whole is, that these protuberances had some connexion with the use of horns as symbols of sovereignty, glory, power, strength. Hab. 3. 4, 'He had *horns* coming out of his hands, and there was the biding of his *power*.' But we shall have more to say upon this point in the sequel.

3. *His pans to receive his ashes.* Heb. סִירוֹתָאֻי *sirothauv*; a word which signifies either *pots* or *pans*, but which is here doubtless to be taken in the latter sense, as appears from the specified use to which they were applied. The original term, however, rendered 'to receive his ashes' (לְדָשֵׁנוּ *ledashsheno*), signifies rather *to remove, to carry out* the ashes which fell from the grate to the earth within the compass of the Altar. The pans were employed for the purpose of taking up these ashes and carrying them to a clean place, as we learn from Lev. 4. 12.—¶ *His shovels.* יַעֲיִי *yaauv*. The radical יַעֲיִי *ya'ih* has a sense so near that of *collecting together by scraping*, that some of the older interpreters have rendered the present word by *besoms* or *brooms*. But as they were made of brass, that rendering is obviously untenable, and we are warranted in understanding by the term the *fire-shovels* by which the ashes were *scraped together in a heap*, and then thrown into the pans.—¶ *His basons.* Heb. מִזְרֶקְתָּאֻי *mizrekothauv*, *sprinkling vessels*. Gr. τὰς φιάλας αὐτοῦ, *his vials*. The term comes from זָרַק *zarak*, *to sprinkle*, and properly denotes the vessels or bowls into which the blood of the sacrifices was received, that it might thence be *sprinkled* on the people, on the horns of the Altar, &c.—¶ *His flesh-hooks.* Heb. מִזְלֶגְתָּאֻי *mizlegothauv*. Gr. τὰς

4 And thou shalt make for it a grate of net-work of brass; and upon the net shalt thou make four

αργαῖρας αὐτοῦ, defined by the Lexicons *hooked instruments for drawing out the meat*; i. e. for picking up and replacing any portion of the sacrifice which may have fallen out of the fire, or off from the Altar. Probably no more suitable word could be adopted by which to render it than the one chosen by our translators, *flesh-hooks*. By its being rendered *tridents* in some of the old versions, we infer that it was a *three-pronged* instrument in the form of a *curved fork*. We may gather somewhat more respecting its use from 1 Sam. 2. 13, 14, 'And the priest's custom with the people was, that when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant came, while the flesh was in seething, with a *flesh-hook* (מזלג *mazleg*) of three teeth in his hand; and he struck it into the pan, or kettle, or caldron, or pot; all that the *flesh-hook* (מזלג *mazleg*) brought up the priest took for himself. So they did in Shiloh unto all the Israelites that came thither.' The Heb. זלג *zalag* has the general import of *curvature* or *crookedness of form*, and it is a little remarkable that, as Bochart has observed, the ancient name of Messina in Sicily was *Zanklé* (Ζαγκλη) from its resemblance to a *sickle* which Thucydides says they called *zanklon* (ζαγκλον); whence Ovid (Trist. L. IV.) speaking of the same city, says,

Quique locus curvæ nomina falcis habet.

The place that's from the *crooked sickle* named.

The Greek word is no doubt of Punic or Phœnician and not Sicilian origin, formed by transposing the letters ג (g) and ל (l). To the same root is probably to be traced the Gr. σκολιός *crooked* and σκαληνός *scalene*, and also the English *sickle*.—¶ *His fire-pans*. Heb. ברתהריר

brazen rings in the four corners thereof.

5 And thou shalt put it under the

מחבתהוֹר. Gr. τὸ πορτεῖον αὐτοῦ, *his fire-receptacle*. Bp. Patrick's explanation of this term is perhaps the most probable. He supposes it to have been 'a larger sort of vessel, wherein the sacred fire, which came down from heaven (Lev. 9. 24,) was kept burning whilst they cleansed the Altar and the grate from the coals and ashes; and while the Altar was carried from one place to another, as it often was in the wilderness.' The root חתה *hathah* has the import of *keeping fire alive* or *glowing*, and from this root probably comes the Gr. αἶθω, *to burn*, and Eng. *heat* and *hot*.

4, 5. *Thou shalt make for it a grate of net-work of brass, &c.* From the phraseology of the text it would appear, that this brazen grating was let into the hollow of the Altar, and sunk so far below the upper surface that its bottom, which was probably convex, reached to midway of the height of the Altar; 'that the net may be even to the midst of the Altar.' Being thus made of net-work like a sieve, and hung hollow, the fire would burn the better, and the ashes would sift through into the hollow of the Altar, from whence they were removed through a door constructed for the purpose. The four rings attached to the corners of this grated partition were for the purpose of lifting it out and putting it in. Some of the elder commentators have suggested that these rings were connected by chains with the horns of the Altar, which thus served an important purpose in suspending the grate. However this may be it is altogether probable that the rings fell within the compass of the Altar below the top, and were not seen without. Some writers have been much censured by a fancied difficulty in seeing how the wood-work of the Altar could be kept from being burnt, when exposed

compass of the altar beneath, that the net may be even to the midst of the altar.

6 And thou shalt make staves for the altar, staves of shittim-wood, and overlay them with brass.

7 And the staves shall be put into


to such a constant heat. But nothing forbids the supposition, that it was cased both *within* and *without* with plates of metal; and for further security a lining of stone might easily have been laid within against the sides of the frame, and as the grate was sus-

the rings, and the staves shall be upon the two sides of the altar to bear it.

8 Hollow with boards shalt thou make it: as it was shewed thee in the mount, so shall they make it.

c ch. 25. 40. & 26. 30.

ended by the rings, and the fire nowhere in contact with the frame, besides the whole being under the continual inspection of the priests, the danger of combustion was very slight. The annexed cut will supersede any more minute description.



THE ALTAR OF SACRIFICE.

In pursuance of our general plan, it will be requisite here to endeavor to ascertain the typical import of the Altar of Offering. The *a priori* presumption that it possessed such a character will be seen to be abundantly confirmed by the evidence now to be adduced. This evidence, it is true, is seldom found in the Scriptures in the form of *direct assertion*, but in the way of *pointed allusion* and *inference* it is perhaps equally unequivocal. And this remark holds good in respect to many of the typical objects, persons, and institutions of the Mosaic economy. While they are not *expressly affirmed* to have

represented corresponding realities under the gospel dispensation, yet we find our Lord and his apostles arguing in such a way as to recognise the truth of this principle of typical or spiritual interpretation. That the principle, in its practical application, may be and has been carried to the wildest and most extravagant extent by writers of imaginative temperament, is but too obvious to admit of question. But we see not why this fact should be allowed to invalidate the soundness of the principle itself. Under the control of a subdued and sober judgment, it is a principle which may be safely and profitably re-



cognised, and in nothing more so than in reference to those great and paramount features of the Mosaic ritual which we are now considering. Among these the Altar of Sacrifice holds too prominent a place not to partake in large measure of that typical character which pertained to the sacrifices themselves, and which no one in that relation thinks of questioning. Let us see then what may be gathered as to the spiritual bearing of this part of the legal shadows.

Of the preeminent *sanctity* which attached to the Altar by divine appointment nothing can be a stronger proof than the words of God himself, Ex. 29. 37, 'Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and *sanctify it*; and it shall be an altar *most holy*: whatsoever toucheth the altar *shall be holy*;' or rather *shall become holy, shall be sanctified*. Hence the declaration of our Savior, that 'the altar *sanctifieth* the gift.' This then is an important item in our consideration of the typical design of this structure; it pointed to something sustaining a character of paramount *holiness*, and this character is evidently sustained by the subject of it in connexion with some kind of *mediatorial function*, which was, with one consent attributed by the ancient Jewish writers to the Altar of Burnt-offerings, as a part of its typical uses. Indeed they expressly denominated it מִזְבֵּחַ הַמִּטְעַן *mizbēah hammetzēah*, the mediator altar, and as *intercession* is one of the principal offices of a mediator, it was also called פֶּרַקְלִיט *peraklit*, παρακλητος, *paraclete*, advocate, the same word which Christ applies to the Holy Spirit as the *comforting advocate* whom he would send to his people to supply the lack of his own presence, and which is explained in the Gemara to mean 'an interpreter, daysman, or kind intercessor in behalf of a person with the king.' This view of the subject does not, it is true, rest upon express

scriptural authority, but it is altogether consistent with it, and rises naturally out of the ideas which its local position between the Presence in the Tabernacle and the people in the Court, and its office as a *sacrificatory* suggested. Among the ancient Orientals, the usages of royalty forbade the access of subjects of common rank to the person of the king without the offices of a mediator, and more especially to those who had in any way incurred the monarch's displeasure, of which a striking illustration is to be seen in the case of Absalom, 2 Sam. 14. 32, 33. That the Israelites habitually ascribed this *mediating* or *reconciling* virtue to the Altar, there can be no doubt, although we may be constrained to admit that, confounding the type with the antitype, they blindly ascribed this efficacy to the material fabric, instead of recognising its ulterior reference to another Mediator 'of higher name,' who was to open the way of access to the Father by the sacrifice of himself. For that this was in fact the real typical purport of the Altar of sacrifice, cannot for a moment be questioned by any one who considers its intrinsic adaptedness to shadow forth the divine substance in its mediatory relations to a holy God and offending sinners. It is indeed certain that this typical design both of the Altar and Sacrifices offered upon it points to a *common* substance which we recognise in the person and offices of Christ, but a discrimination may still be made between what is more immediately applicable to the one and to the other respectively.

Taking it for granted that the idea of *mediatorship* is fundamental in the typical institute of the Altar, we are naturally led to investigate the points of analogy in this respect between the shadow and the substance. Now it is obvious that one of the leading offices of a mediator is the *procurement of peace*, or the *reconciliation of offended*

and contending parties, and we have the decided evidence of heathen antiquity in favor of connecting this effect with the symbolical uses of altars. Thus Virgil (*Æn.* IV. 56.) says,

*Principio delubra advent, pacemque per aras  
Exquirunt.*

'First they repair to the shrines and through the medium of altars solicit peace.' The same office is attributed to the Mosaic Altar and its offerings by Rabbi Menahem; 'And an altar was made that it might conciliate peace between the Israelites and their Father in heaven through the mysteries of sacrifice.' This point is made still more evident if we connect with the Altar the act of expiation in which it was mainly instrumental, as we learn from the most express Rabbinical authority. 'This is that Altar,' says the Midrash Rabbath, 'which was in the temple and expiated the children of Israel.' Another also of the Jewish authorities says, that 'when the sprinkled blood touches the Altar, then those are expiated who offer the sacrifice.' Closely connected with the conciliatory or peace-procuring design of the Altar was that which it subserved as a table or board of feasting to the parties which were thus brought to mutual fellowship; as it is well known that, except in the case of the holocaust, the priests and some times the offerer too feasted upon a portion of the offerings. Accordingly the sacrifices offered upon the Altar are expressly spoken of, Num. 28. 2, as bread or food laid upon a table, and in Mal. 1. 7, it is said, 'Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible.' Eating together at the same table has ever been accounted among the Orientals the most unequivocal pledge of amity, union, and common interest, and accordingly the Apostle conveys the idea of the

closest possible relation and fellowship when he says, 1 Cor. 10. 18, 'Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?' That is, they were bound in most solemn covenant ties to him whose table the altar was. Consequently they could not eat of the sacrifices of idol altars without virtually eating at the table of idols, and thus entering into fellowship with them. But Christ is the true altar of fellowship for Christians, and its import both as an altar and a table is fulfilled in him.

We remark again that affording succor and protection to the weak, the pursued, the endangered, is another idea naturally connected with the mediatory uses of an altar. And such a purpose we find answered by the Altar of Burnt-offerings in the case of Adonijah and Joab, who both flew to it as an asylum when the guilt of treason and blood had put their lives in peril. The same character was ascribed by the heathen to their altars, as we learn from numerous passages in the classics. Flying to and sitting down by an altar was a significant mode of claiming protection from vengeance. How perfectly the succoring and saving offices of Christ towards the guilty fulfil these typical uses of the Altar is too obvious to require elucidation.

This use of the Altar as a place of refuge seems to be intimately connected with the horns by which it was distinguished. The culprit who fled to it seized hold of its horns, and it was from thence that Joab was dragged and slain. Now the horn was one of the most indubitable symbols of power, as we learn from the frequent employment of it in this sense by the sacred writers. In Hab. 3. 4, for instance, it is said, 'He had horns coming out of his hand, and there was the hiding of his power.' The 'horn of David' is the power and dominion of David, and Christ is called a 'horn of salvation,' from his being a mighty Savior, invest-

9 ¶ And <sup>d</sup> thou shalt make the court of the tabernacle: for the south side southward *there shall be*

<sup>d</sup> ch. 38. 9.

ed with royal dignity, and able to put down with triumph and ease all his enemies. It is probably in real, though latent allusion to the *horned altar* and its *pacifying* character that God says through the prophet, Is. 27. 5, 'let him take hold of my *strength*, that he may *make peace with me*; and he shall make peace with me;' let him fly to the horns of the mystic Altar, and find security and peace in that *reconciled omnipotence* of which it was the sign. As the Altar then is primarily an adumbration of Christ in his mediatorial office, the *horns* may very suitably denote those attributes of his character which as symbols they are adapted and designed to shadow forth. As the *strength* of all horned animals, that strength by which they defend themselves and their young, is concentrated mainly in their horns, so in the ascription of horns to Christ we recognise the symbol of that *divine potency* by which he is able to subdue all things to himself, and to afford complete protection to his people. In accordance with this, the visions of the Apocalypse represent him as 'a Lamb *having seven horns*,' as the mystic insignia of that irresistible power with which he effects the discomfiture of his adversaries and *pushes* his spiritual conquests over the world. This view of the typical import of the Altar and its appendages might doubtless be much enlarged, but sufficient has been said to show, that the same rich significance and the same happy adaptation, pervades this as reigns through every other part of the Mosaic ritual.

#### THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE.

9. *Thou shalt make the court of the Tabernacle.* This court or open enclosure, in which the Tabernacle stood,

hangings for the court of fine twined linen of an hundred cubits long for one side:

was of an oblong figure of a hundred cubits (about fifty-eight yards) in length by half that breadth, and the height of the enclosing fence or curtain was five cubits, or nearly three yards, being half the height of the Tabernacle. The enclosure was formed by a plain hanging of fine twined linen yarn, which seems to have been worked in an open or network texture, so that the people without might freely see the interior. The door-curtain was however of a different texture from the general hanging, being a great curtain of 'fine twined linen,' embroidered with blue, purple, and scarlet. It is described in precisely the same terms as the door-curtain of the Tabernacle itself, and was of the same fabric with the inner covering of the Tabernacle and the vail before the Holy of Holies. It was furnished with cords, by which it might be drawn up or aside when the priests had occasion to enter. The curtains of this enclosure were hung upon sixty pillars of brass, standing on bases of the same metal, but with capitals and fillets of silver. (Compare the description in this chapter with that in chap 38.) The hooks also, to which the curtains were attached, were of silver. The entrance of the Court was at the east end opposite that to the Tabernacle, and between them stood the Altar of Burnt-offering, but nearer to the door of the Tabernacle than to that of the Court. It is uncertain whether the brazen laver was interposed between the Altar and the door of the Tabernacle or not. Chap. 30. 18, certainly conveys that impression; but the Rabbins, who appear to have felt that nothing could properly interpose between the Altar and Tabernacle, say that the laver was indeed nearer to the Tabernacle than was the Altar, but still

10 And the twenty pillars thereof and their twenty sockets *shall be of brass*: the hooks of the pillars and their fillets *shall be of silver*.

11 And likewise for the north side in length *there shall be hangings of a hundred cubits long*, and


that it did not stand in the same line with the Altar, but stood a little on one side to the south. As to the position of the Tabernacle in the Court, nothing is said in the Scriptures on the subject, but it seems less probable that it stood in the centre than that it was placed towards the farther or western extremity, so as to allow greater space for the services which were to be performed exclusively in front of the Tabernacle. Within the precincts of this Court any Israelite might enter, but none but the

his twenty pillars and their twenty sockets *of brass*: the hooks of the pillars and their fillets *of silver*.

12 ¶ And *for the breadth of the court on the west side shall be hangings of fifty cubits*: their pillars ten, and their sockets ten.

priests were permitted to go into the outer room of the Tabernacle, and into its inner recess admission was forbidden to all but the high priest. A view of the Tabernacle with its curtained enclosure will hereafter be given.

10. *The twenty pillars thereof, and their twenty sockets, &c.* These pillars, which were probably made of shittim-wood, were placed at five cubits distance from each other, in sockets of brass, in the manner represented in the cut.



PILLAR AND SOCKET, WITH CORDS AND STAKES.

¶ *Fillets.* Heb. השוקרים *hashukim*, from the root השק *hashak* which has the sense of *connecting, conjoining*, whence Rosenmuller and others with much probability understand by the term the connecting rods of silver between the heads of the pillars, on which the curtains were suspended. Otherwise it is rendered as in our version *fillets*, by which is meant raised ornamental bands or mouldings encircling the tops of the pillars.

12. *Breadth, fifty cubits.* The breadth of the Court was therefore equal to one half its length; the whole area being of an oblong square, one hundred cubits in length and fifty in breadth. The form and proportions of the Tabernacle itself were nearly the same, being thirty cubits in length and twelve in breadth.

14. *Fifteen cubits.* As twenty out of the fifty cubits which measured the breadth of the Court on the eastern side

13 And the breadth of the court on the east side eastward *shall be* fifty cubits.

14 The hangings of one side of the gate *shall be* fifteen cubits: their pillars three, and their sockets three.

15 And on the other side *shall be* hangings, fifteen cubits: their pillars three, and their sockets three.

16 ¶ And for the gate of the court *shall be* a hanging of twenty cubits, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, wrought with needle-work: and their pillars *shall be* four, and their sockets four.

17 All the pillars round about the court *shall be* filleted with silver: their hooks *shall be* of silver, and their sockets of brass.

18 ¶ The length of the court *shall be* an hundred cubits, and the breadth fifty every where, and the

were to be appropriated to the gate or entrance-way, this would leave of course fifteen cubits on each side.

19. *The pins of the court.* The nails or small stakes which were driven into the ground that the hangings, attached to them by cords, might be made fast at the bottom. They are represented in the cut above. In allusion to these and in view of its future glorious enlargement, the prophet thus apostrophizes the church, Is. 54. 1—3, ‘Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations; spare not, *lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes*; For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited.’ See Mr. Barnes’s Note on the passage.

height five cubits of fine twined linen, and their sockets of brass.

19 All the vessels of the tabernacle in all the service thereof, and all the pins thereof, and all the pins of the court, *shall be* of brass.

20 ¶ And <sup>e</sup>thou shalt command the children of Israel, that they bring thee pure oil olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always.

21 In the tabernacle of the congregation <sup>f</sup>without the vail, which is before the testimony, <sup>g</sup>Aaron and his sons shall order it from evening to morning before the LORD: <sup>h</sup>*It shall be* a statute for ever unto their generations on the behalf of the children of Israel.

<sup>e</sup> Lev. 24. 2. <sup>f</sup> ch. 26. 31, 33. <sup>g</sup> ch. 30. 8. 1 Sam. 3. 3. 2 Chron. 13. 11. <sup>h</sup> ch. 23. 43. & 29. 9, 28. Lev. 3. 17 & 16. 34. & 24. 9. Numb. 18. 23. & 19. 21. 1 Sam. 30. 25.

#### THE OIL FOR THE CANDLESTICK.

20. *Pure oil olive beaten.* The Lamp was to be fed with pure oil, prepared from olives which were bruised with a pestle, and so free from the sediment and dregs which were apt to mar that that was obtained from an oil-press or mill. ‘By the expression *oil olive*, this oil is distinguished from other kinds. The addition *beaten*, indicates that it is that oil obtained from olives pounded in a mortar, and not pressed from olives in the oil-mill. The oil obtained from pounded olives is, according to Columella’s observation, much purer and better tasted, does not emit much smoke, and has no offensive smell.’ Burder. —¶ *To cause the lamp to burn always.* To light it regularly every night. That is said, according to Scripture usage, to be *always* done, which never fails to be done at the appointed season. Thus a ‘continual burnt-offering’ is one which is continually offered *at the stated time.*

21. *In the tabernacle of the congre-*

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

AND take thou unto thee <sup>a</sup> Aaron thy brother, and his sons with

gation. Heb. *אהל מועד ohel mo'ed*, *tabernacle of appointment*, or of *stated meeting*. The common rendering, 'tabernacle of the congregation,' implies that it was so called merely from the fact of the peoples' there *congregating* to attend upon the worship of God, whereas the genuine force of the original expression imports not only the *meeting* of the people with each other, a general assembling of the host, but the *meeting of God* also with them, according to his promise, v. 43. '*And there will I meet with the children of Israel, and the Tabernacle shall be sanctified with my glory.*' The Hebrew *מועד mo'ed*, the term in question, strictly signifies a *meeting by appointment, a convention at a time and place previously agreed upon by the parties*. The Chaldee both of Onkelos and Jonathan render this by *משכן זמנא mishkan zimna, tabernacle of appointed time*, implying that at *stated seasons* the children of Israel were to have recourse thither.—¶ *Which is before the testimony*. That is, before the Ark of the testimony. See ch. 25. 21, 22.—¶ *Aaron and his sons shall order it from evening to morning*. Josephus, in speaking of the duty of the priests (Ant. L. III. ch. 8.), says, 'They were also to keep oil already purified for the lamps; three of which were to give light all day long, upon the sacred Candlestick before God, and the rest were to be lighted at the evening.' It is not unreasonable to suppose that this was the case, although the authority of Josephus cannot be considered as *decisive* of any point of Jewish antiquity. Still as he was nearest the source of tradition, his testimony is always worthy of being carefully weighed, although the whole ritual had no doubt undergone great changes before his time.

him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto

<sup>a</sup> Numb. 18. 7. Hebr. 5. 1, 4.

The following detailed account of the manner of 'ordering' the lamps is given by Ainsworth from Maimonides. As a Rabbinical relic exhibiting a striking specimen of the scrupulous exactness with which every part of the Tabernacle service was performed, it is not without its interest. 'Of every lamp that is burnt out, he takes away the wick, and all the oil that remaineth in the lamp, and wipeth it, and putteth in another wick, and other oil by measure, and that is an half a log (about a quarter of a pint); and that which he taketh away he casteth into the place of ashes by the altar, and lighteth the lamp which was out, and the lamp which he findeth not out, he dresseth it. The lamp which is middlemost, when it is out, he lights not it but from the altar in the court; but the rest of the lamps, every one that is out he lighteth from the lamp that is next. He lighteth not all the lamps at one time; but lighteth five lamps, and stayeth, and doth the other service; and afterwards cometh and lighteth the two that remain. He whose duty it is to dress the candlestick cometh with a golden vessel in his hand (called Cuz, like to a great pitcher) to take away in it the wicks that are burnt out, and the oil that remaineth in the lamps, and lighteth five of the lamps, and beareth the vessel there before the Candlestick, and goeth out; afterwards he cometh and lighteth the two lamps, and taketh up the vessel in his hand, and boweth down to worship, and goeth his way.' *Treat. of the Daily Sacrifice*, C. III. Sect. 12—17.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

## THE PRIESTLY GARMENTS.

As full and ample directions had now

me in the priest's office, *even* | Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons.

been given in respect to rearing and furnishing the Tabernacle as a place of worship, we have in the present chapter an intimation of the setting apart an order of men to officiate as ministers of this worship, and a minute description of the vestment by which they were to be distinguished. Previous to this time the patriarchal mode of service had no doubt obtained, every master of a family being a priest to his own household; but now as a Tabernacle of the congregation was about to be erected, as a visible centre of unity to the nation, God saw fit to order the institutions of a public priesthood, and according to previous intimation, Ex. 27. 21, Aaron and his sons are here fixed upon as candidates for the high distinction.

1. *Take thou unto thee.* Heb. **הִקְרֵב** *hakrīb*, *cause to come nigh*. Gr. *προσάγαγον*, *bring near*. The original root **קָרַב** *karab* is of the most frequent occurrence in relation to sacrifices, and is the ordinary term applied to the *bringing near* or *presenting* the various offerings which were enjoined under the Mosaic ritual. It is wholly in keeping with this usage to employ it, as here, in reference to *persons* who by their dedication to the service of the sanctuary, were in a sense *sacrificially offered up* and *devoted* to God. Before entering upon the description of the sacerdotal dresses, the historian prefaces a few words respecting those who were to wear them, viz., Aaron and his sons; of whose solemn consecration to office a full account is given in the next chapter. God is introduced as especially designating and appointing these individuals to the sacred function of the priesthood; and this would have the effect at once to show that this was an honor too great to be assumed by men without a call from heaven, according to the Apostle's statement, Heb. 5. 4,

and also to free both Moses and Aaron from the charge of grasping this distinction for the purpose of aggrandizing their own family.—π *That he may minister.* Heb. **לְכַהֵן** *lekahano*, from the root **כָּהֵן** *kahan*, of which Kimchi says the primary meaning is the *rendering of honorable and dignified service*, such as that of officers of state to their sovereign. In accordance with this it is used concerning the sons of David, 2 Sam. 8. 18, who could not, strictly speaking, be priests; and on the same grounds the substantive **כֹּהֲנִים** *kohanim* is in several places in the margin rendered 'princes.' See Note on Gen. 14. 18. But as *princes* or courtiers wait on the king, and are honored by nearer access to him than others; so the priests under the law were assumed into this near relation to the King of Israel, and for this reason the term in its ordinary acceptation is applied more especially to the duties of priests in ministering before God at his altar. The remark is no doubt well founded, that wherever the word is connected with any of the names of God, it always denotes a *priest*; but when standing alone it usually means a *prince*, or some person of eminence. Comp. Ex. 2. 16. Of the duties pertaining to the priestly office we shall have occasion to speak in detail in subsequent notes; but we may here observe briefly, that although as high functionaries in the court of the Great King, many of their duties were of a civil nature, as might be expected under a system in which *church* and *state* were united, yet those that more properly belonged to them in their sacerdotal character were mainly the following: They were to pronounce the benediction upon the people and to conduct the whole service of the holy place. Their's was the business of sacrificing,

2 And <sup>b</sup>thou shalt make holy

<sup>b</sup> ch. 29. 5, 29. & 31. 10. & 39. 1, 2. Lev. 8. 7, 30. Numb. 20. 26, 28.

in all its rites, in all offerings upon the altar of burnt-offerings. The government and ordering of the sanctuary and of the house of God lay upon them. They kept the table of show-bread properly supplied; they attended to the lamps of golden candelabrum every morning: at the same time they burnt the daily incense, which prevented any offensive scent from the dressing of the lamps from being perceived. It was their duty to keep up the fire upon the brazen altar, that the fire originally kindled from heaven might never be extinguished. It was their office to make the holy anointing oil; and their's to blow the silver trumpets at the solemn feasts, and also before the Ark at its removals. While their numbers were few, there was occupation enough to keep them all employed; but when they afterwards became numerous, they were divided into twenty-four bands, or courses, each of which undertook weekly, in rotation, the sacred services. But this regulation belongs to the time of David, and remains to be considered in another place. Although the Most High had before, Ex. 19. 6, said of Israel in general, 'that they should be to him a kingdom of priests,' yet this did not militate with his *concentrating* the office, in its active duties, in a single family, as he now saw fit to do. It was only in this way that the great ends of the institution could be attained. Of the four sons of Aaron here selected, the two eldest, Nadab and Abihu, unfortunately showed themselves ere long unworthy of the honor now conferred upon them, and perished miserably in consequence of their presumptuous levity in the discharge of their office. The succession then reverted to the line of Eleazar and Ithamar, in which it was perpetuated down to the latest period of the Jewish polity.

garments for Aaron thy brother for glory and for beauty.

2. *Holy garments.* Heb. כְּדֵר קֹדֶשׁ *bigdē kodesh*, garments of holiness. Gr στολη ἁγία, *a holy stole*, or perhaps collectively *a quantity of holy stoles*. These garments are called 'holy' because they were designed for holy men, and because they formed part of an establishment whose general character was *holy*. Indeed, whatever was separated from common use, and consecrated to the immediate service of God, acquired thereby a *relative holiness*; so that we see the amplest ground for the bestowment of this epithet upon the sacred dresses. In ordinary life, when not engaged in their official duties, the priests were attired like other Israelites of good condition; but when employed in their stated ministrations, they were to be distinguished by a peculiar and appropriate dress. Of this dress, which was kept in a wardrobe somehow connected with the Tabernacle, and which was laid aside when their ministration ceased, and returned to the wardrobe, the Jewish writers have much to say. According to them the priests could not officiate without their robes, neither could they wear them beyond the sacred precincts. Under the Temple, where the usages were no doubt substantially the same as in the Tabernacle, when the priests arrived to take their turns of duty, they put off their usual dress, washed themselves in water, and put on the holy garments. While they were in the Temple, attending upon their service, they could not sleep in their sacred habits, but in their own wearing clothes. These they put off in the morning, when they went to their service, and, after bathing, resumed their official dress.—But we shall treat of the details in their order.—¶ *For glory and for beauty.* Heb. לְכָבוֹד וּלְתִפְאַרֶת *le-kabod u-letiphareth*, for glory, or honor,



3 And <sup>e</sup> thou shalt speak unto all *that are* wise-hearted, <sup>d</sup> whom I have filled with the spirit of wisdom, that they may make Aaron's garments to consecrate him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office.

4 And these *are* the garments

<sup>e</sup> ch. 31. 6. & 36. 1. <sup>d</sup> ch. 31. 3. & 35. 30, 31.

and for *beauty, ornament, decoration*. The expression is very strong, leading us to the inference that a special significance and importance attached to these garments. They were to be made thus splendid in order to render the office more respected, and to inspire a becoming reverence for the Divine Majesty, whose ministers were attired with so much grandeur. As every thing pertaining to the sanctuary was to be made august and magnificent, so were the dresses of those who ministered there. Yet we cannot doubt that a typical design governed the fashion and appearance of these gorgeous robes, and that they pointed forward to the 'glory' and 'beauty' both of the internal character and the outward display of the 'great High Priest' of the church, in his yet future manifestation. We may perhaps recognise also a secondary allusion to the beautiful spiritual investment both of his ministers and people, in that bright period when they shall have laid aside the 'filthy garments' of their captivity and degradation, and shall shine forth as the 'perfection of beauty in the whole earth,' being clothed in that 'clean linen which is the righteousness of saints.' Accordingly it is said, Is. 51. 1, 'Put on thy *beautiful garments* (Heb. בגדי תפארת *bigdē tipharthēk*, *garments of thy beauty*),' the very word here employed.

3. *Speak unto all that are wise-hearted*. Heb. אל כל חכמי לב *el kol hakmē lēb*, *to all wise of heart*. Gr. πᾶσι τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ διανοίᾳ, *to all wise in understanding*. That is, skilful, ex-

which they shall make; <sup>e</sup> a breast-plate, and <sup>f</sup> an ephod, and <sup>g</sup> a robe, and <sup>h</sup> a brodered coat, a mitre, and a girdle: and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, and his sons, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office.

<sup>e</sup> ver. 15. <sup>f</sup> ver. 6. <sup>g</sup> ver. 31. <sup>h</sup> ver. 39.

pert, ingenious, as artists. It is clearly intimated, however, by the connected phrase, 'whom I have filled with the spirit of wisdom' that the epithet implies more than the mere native gifts and endowments which might be possessed by any in this line. Whatever mechanical skill might be evinced by any of the people, yet here was a work to be executed which required something still higher, and therefore God was pleased to impart a special inspiration to endow them with the requisite ability. Compare this with Is. 28. 23—29, where even the necessary skill for rightly conducting the occupations of husbandry are referred to the same source. To the right-minded it is pleasant as well as proper to ascribe to the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift, the glory of whatever talents may give us eminence or success in any of the lawful or honorable callings of life. —¶ *To consecrate him*. To render him consecrated; to be a badge and sign of his consecration.

4, 5. *These are the garments, &c.* Of the garments here appointed to be made of these rich materials four were common to the high priest and the inferior priests; viz., the linen breeches, the linen coat, the linen girdle, and the bonnet or turban; that which the high priest wore is called a mitre. The remaining four were peculiar to the high priest, viz., the ephod with its curious girdle, the breast-plate, the long robe with its bells and pomegranates, and the golden plate on his forehead. *These*

5 And they shall take gold, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen.

6 ¶ And they shall make the ephod of gold, of blue, and of purple, of scarlet, and fine twined linen, with cunning work.

7 It shall have the two shoulder-

<sup>1</sup> ch. 39. 2.

last are frequently termed by the Rabbinical writers, by way of distinction, the בגדי זהב *bigdē zahab*, garments of gold while the others, made of linen, are called בגדי לבן *bigdē laban*, garments of white. We shall consider each of them in order. We may here remark, however, that on one day in the year, viz., the great day of atonement, or fast of annual expiation, the High Priest wore none of the golden garments, but appeared, like the rest of the priests, simply in habiliments of white linen. Even his mitre was then made of linen. The reason of this was, that the day of atonement was a day of humiliation; and as the High Priest was then to offer sacrifices for his own sins, as well as those of the people, he was to be so clad as to indicate that he could lay claim to no exemption on the score of frailty and guilt; that he recognised the fact that in the need of expiation, the highest and the lowest, the priest and the Levite, stood on a level before God, with whom there is no distinction of persons.

#### THE EPHOD.

6. They shall make the ephod, &c. Heb. אֶפֶד *ēphod*. Gr. *επώμυδα*, shoulder-piece. The original comes from אָפַד *aphad*, to bind or gird on, and therefore signifies in general something to be girded on; but as to the precise form of the vestment itself it is difficult to gather from the words of the narrative a very distinct notion; and even if we succeed in this, we must still depend mainly upon a pictured representation to convey an adequate idea of it to the


pieces thereof joined at the two edges thereof; and so it shall be joined together.

8 And the curious girdle of the ephod, which is upon it, shall be of the same, according to the work thereof; even of gold, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen.

reader. From an attentive comparison of all that is said of the Ephod in the sacred text, commentators are for the most part agreed in considering it as approaching to the form of a short double apron, having the two parts connected by two wide straps united on the shoulders. These are called, v. 7, the two shoulder-pieces, which were to be joined at the two edges thereof; i. e. on the very apex of the shoulders. This junction was effected in some way under the two onyx-stones and at the precise point where they rested upon the shoulders. These stones are said by Josephus (who calls them 'sardonystones') to have been very splendid, and Bähr thinks that the symbolical significancy of the Ephod was mainly concentrated in these 'shoulder-pieces,' which, like our modern *epaulettes*, were a badge of dignity, authority, command—an idea to which we shall advert in the sequel. The two main pieces or lappets of the Ephod hung down, the one in front, the other behind, but to what depth is not stated, although Josephus says it was a cubit, which would bring their lower extremity about to the loins. It seems to us probable on the whole that the posterior portion hung down from the shoulders considerably lower than the anterior. But without some other appendage these dorsal and pectoral coverings would hang loose upon the person, to prevent which a 'curious girdle,' forming an integral part of the Ephod itself, and composed probably of two distinct bands issuing from the sides of either

the frontal or hinder portion, passed round the body just under the arms so as to encircle it over the region of the heart. The annexed cut will aid the reader's conception. The open space


in the front piece is designed for the insertion of the Breast-plate. The appendant straps when brought around the body formed the 'curious girdle of the Ephod.'



THE EPHOD.

In this representation we have mainly followed Braunius in his celebrated work on the Dresses of the Jewish Priests, as that which we regard as on the whole the most probable; but Gussenius, one of the ablest of the Hebrew

Lexicographers, contends for a form approaching nearer to that of a belt or girdle for the whole Ephod, and there is so much that is plausible in his view, that we are induced to give a copy of his engraving.



Such appears to have been the general form of the Ephod, and the manner in  
Vor. II.

which it was made to be fitted close to the body. As to the material of which

9 And thou shalt take two onyx-stones, and grave on them the names of the children of Israel :

10 Six of their names on one stone, and *the other* six names of the rest on the other stone, according to their birth.

11 With the work of an engraver

it was made, this was evidently the same with that of the interior curtains and the separating vail of the Tabernacle, and wrought like it, except that in this ephod-tapestry the figures of cherubim were wanting, and instead of them there was a rich interweaving of threads of gold, which together with the beautiful colors embroidered, must have given it an air of inexpressible richness. On this point the Jewish writers say, 'The gold that was in the weaving of the ephod and breast-plate was thus wrought: He (the cunning workman) took one thread of pure gold and put it with six threads of blue and twisted these seven threads as one. And so he did one thread of gold with six of purple, and one with six of scarlet, and one with six of linen. Thus these four threads of gold and twenty-eight threads in all.' *Maimonides in Ainsworth*. This is a very probable account of the mode of texture, though the proportion of gold strikes us as very small. From the allusion in the description of our Savior's dress, Rev. 1. 13, 'Clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a *golden girdle*,' it is reasonably to be inferred that it contained a pretty copious insertion of gold in its texture, from which fact the curious girdle of the Ephod was usually distinguished by this epithet. Though properly and primarily a vestment of the High Priest, yet it appears that garments of the same name were worn by the inferior priests, but they were plain ones of linen. It does not appear that even these were worn at first by the common priests. But we after-

in stone, *like* the engravings of a signet, shalt thou engrave the two stones with the names of the children of Israel: thou shalt make them to be set in ouches of gold.

12 And thou shalt put the two stones upon the shoulders of the ephod *for* stones of memorial unto

wards read of common priests wearing Ephods; and indeed Samuel, who was only a Levite, wore one; and David, who was not even a Levite, did the same when he danced before the ark. On one occasion Saul consulted the Lord by Urim, and consequently used the Ephod of the high priest, 1 Sam. 28. 6; and on another occasion David did the same, 1 Sam. 30. 7. It is thought by some, however that Saul and David did not themselves use the Ephod, but directed the priest to use it.

9—12. *Thou shalt take two onyx-stones, &c.* On each of the connecting pieces that went across the shoulders was set an arch or socket of gold, containing an onyx-stone (Chal. 'Beryl-stone') on which the names of the tribes of Israel were engraved, as in a seal, six on each shoulder. Thus Maimonides; 'He set on each shoulder a beryl-stone four-square, embossed in gold; and he graved on the two stones the names of the tribes, six on one stone and six on the other, according to their births. And the stone whereon Reuben was written, was on the right shoulder, and the stone whereon Simeon was written, was on the left.' The Rabbins say, moreover, that the letters were so equally divided in these two inscriptions that Joseph's name was written 'Jehoseph' in order to make just twenty-five letters in each stone.—

π *According to their birth.* Heb. כֶּתוֹלֶדוֹתָם *ketholedotham, their births or generations.* That is, according to the order of their respective births or ages. The arrangement is diversely understood by Josephus and most of the

the children of Israel: and <sup>1</sup> Aaron shall bear their names before the LORD upon his two shoulders <sup>m</sup> for a memorial.

13 ¶ And thou shalt make ouches of gold;

14 And two chains of pure gold at the ends; of wreathen work

<sup>1</sup> ver. 29. ch. 39. 7. <sup>m</sup> See Josh. 4. 7. Zech. 6. 14.

Rabbinical writers, according to the latter of whom the order was as follows:

Left.

Right.

Gad,  
Asher,  
Issachar,  
Zebulon,  
Joseph,  
Benjamin,

Reuben,  
Simeon,  
Levi,  
Judah,  
Dan,  
Naphtali.

The former, having a special view to their several mothers, arranges them thus;

Simeon,  
Judah,  
Zebulon,  
Dan,  
Asher,  
Benjamin,

Reuben,  
Levi,  
Issachar,  
Naphtali,  
Gad,  
Joseph.

It is a matter of little moment which we consider as the most correct.

12. For stones of memorial unto the children of Israel. That is, as a memorial for or in behalf of the children of Israel; a remembrancer to Aaron and to Israel that he appeared before God in the priestly office as a representative of the whole people. The meaning is in fact explained in the next clause.

#### THE BREAST-PLATE.

15. Thou shalt make the breast-plate of judgment, &c. Heb. חֹשֶׁן משפט *hoshen mishpat*. This would perhaps be better rendered in our version pectoral or breast-piece of judg-

ment, as breast-plate conveys the idea of a military accoutrement, which is not implied in the original. Greek λογειον των κρίσεων, the rationale of judgments, as it is also rendered in the Lat. Vulg. The etymology of the original term חֹשֶׁן *hoshen*, is entirely unknown. Gesenius indeed refers to the Arabic *hashna*, to be fair, beautiful, splendid, as perhaps having affinity with its root, with which he compares the Germ. *scheinen*, to appear, schön, fair, and Eng. *shine*. But though it is equally a matter of conjecture, we for ourselves prefer the suggestion of Avenarius (Lex. ad rad. חֹשֶׁן) that it comes by transposition of letters from נֹחַשׁ *nahash*, to augur, to divine, a sense very nearly akin to that of seeking information by consulting an oracle. Yet we are still unable to establish this or any other as the legitimate formation of the word, and are compelled therefore to content ourselves with such a view of the material, form, and uses of the חֹשֶׁן *hoshen* as can be deduced from the text independent of philological or collateral aid. It was called 'breast-plate of judgment' from its being worn by the High Priest when he went into the Most Holy Place to consult God respecting those matters of judgment which were too hard for the inferior judges, and which had reference to the more important civil or religious concerns of the nation. Comp. Deut. 17. 18, 19. The cloth which formed the ground of the Breast-plate was of the same rich embroidered stuff or

15 ¶ And <sup>n</sup> thou shalt make the breast-plate of judgment with cunning work; after the work of the ephod thou shalt make it; of gold, of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, and of fine twined linen shalt thou make it.

<sup>n</sup> ch. 39. 8.

ment, as breast-plate conveys the idea of a military accoutrement, which is not implied in the original. Greek λογειον των κρίσεων, the rationale of judgments, as it is also rendered in the Lat. Vulg. The etymology of the original term חֹשֶׁן *hoshen*, is entirely unknown. Gesenius indeed refers to the Arabic *hashna*, to be fair, beautiful, splendid, as perhaps having affinity with its root, with which he compares the Germ. *scheinen*, to appear, schön, fair, and Eng. *shine*. But though it is equally a matter of conjecture, we for ourselves prefer the suggestion of Avenarius (Lex. ad rad. חֹשֶׁן) that it comes by transposition of letters from נֹחַשׁ *nahash*, to augur, to divine, a sense very nearly akin to that of seeking information by consulting an oracle. Yet we are still unable to establish this or any other as the legitimate formation of the word, and are compelled therefore to content ourselves with such a view of the material, form, and uses of the חֹשֶׁן *hoshen* as can be deduced from the text independent of philological or collateral aid. It was called 'breast-plate of judgment' from its being worn by the High Priest when he went into the Most Holy Place to consult God respecting those matters of judgment which were too hard for the inferior judges, and which had reference to the more important civil or religious concerns of the nation. Comp. Deut. 17. 18, 19. The cloth which formed the ground of the Breast-plate was of the same rich embroidered stuff or

16 Four-square it shall be, *being* doubled; a span *shall be* the length thereof, and a span *shall be* the breadth thereof.

17 ° And thou shalt set in it settings of stones, *even* four rows of stones; *the first row shall be* a sar-

° ch. 39. 10, &c.

brocade as the Ephod, of two spans in length and one in breadth. Consequently when doubled it was just a span or eighteen inches square. For what reason it was doubled is not apparent. Some suppose it was to give it more strength in bearing the precious stones appended to it. But for ourselves we are unable to see how the back fold could have aided in supporting the weight of the stones in front. Far preferable therefore to us seems the opinion, that it was doubled thus in order that being sewed together on three sides and left open on one it might form a kind of sack, pocket, or bag, as a receptacle of something which was to be put in it. But of this more in the sequel. At each corner of the Breast-plate thus made into a square form was a golden ring. To the two upper ones were attached two golden chains of wreathen work, i. e. chains made of golden threads or wires braided together, which passed up to the shoulders and were there somehow fastened to the shoulder-pieces or to the onyx-stones. By means of these chains it was suspended on the breast. But to render it still more firm in its position, two laces or ribbons of blue were passed through the two rings at the two lower corners of the Breast-plate, and also through two corresponding rings in the Ephod, and then tied together a little above the girdle of the Ephod. This rendered the Breast-plate and Ephod inseparable, so that the latter could not be put on without being accompanied by the former, and the punishment of stripes was decreed against him who

dius, a topaz, and a carbuncle: *this shall be* the first row.

18 And the second row *shall be* an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond.

19 And the third row a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst.

20 And the fourth row a beryl,

should attempt to divide the one from the other.

17. *Thou shalt set in it settings of stones.* Heb. מִלְּאֵת בֹּר מִלְּאֵת אֶבֶן *milli'eth bo milli'ath eben, thou shalt fill in it fillings of stones.* The import undoubtedly is that these stones were to be *set* or *enchased* in sockets of gold or some other metal, and they are called *fillings* because the stones when inserted *filled up* the cavities prepared for their reception. The precise manner in which these twelve precious stones, which had the names of the twelve tribes engraved upon them, were attached to the Breast-plate is not expressed in the text, though it is usually understood by commentators to have been upon the outside, and that they were fully exposed to view when worn upon the High Priest's bosom. This, however, is not asserted in the text, and we shall soon suggest several reasons for doubting whether it were the fact. It is certain that the stones were in some way appended to the Breast-plate, and that they were arranged in four rows, three in each, but as to the peculiar manner in which they were adjusted to the supporting ground of the tapestry, this is a point which is to be *inferred* from an attentive consideration of all the circumstances relating to the fabric itself, and upon this we shall be more full in a subsequent note. At present we shall devote a page or two to the consideration of the stones themselves, in relation to which we are constrained to remark that after all the research expended by antiquarians upon the subject much uncertainty still rests

upon it. They cannot be satisfactorily identified. We can only approach a *probability*, more or less strong, that the gems which we now call the topaz, emerald, sapphire, carbuncle, &c., do truly answer to the original terms which they are thus made to represent in English. Our explanations must be taken therefore by the reader subject to the necessary abatement on this score.

1. SARDIUS. Heb. אדם *odem*, from the radical אדם *adam*, *to be ruddy or red*. Chal. סמקן *samkan*, and סמקתא *samketha*, *red*. Gr. σαρδύιον, *sardine*, a name supposed to be taken from *Sardis* or *Sardinia*, where it was originally found. It was a stone of the *ruby* class, and answers to the *carnelian* of the moderns. The finest specimens now come from *Surat*, a city near the gulf of *Cambay* in *India*.

2. TOPAZ. Heb. פטדה *pitdah*. Etymology unknown. Gr. τοπαζίον, *topazion*, a name which *Pliny* says is derived from *Topazos*, an island in the *Red Sea*. Chal. ירקן *yarkan* and ירקתא *yarketha*, signifying *green*. It is supposed to be the modern *chrysolite*, and its color to have been a transparent *green-yellow*. It comes now from *Egypt*, where it is found in alluvial strata.

3. CARUNCLE. Heb. ברקת *bareketh*, from ברק *barak*, *to lighten, glitter, or glister*; answering to the ἀνθραξ *anthrax*, of the *Greeks*, so called because when held to the sun it resembles a piece of *bright burning charcoal*. Indeed its name *carbuncle* means *a little coal*, and refers us at once to a *lively coal-red*. Its modern name is the *garnet*. The *Septuagint*, *Josephus*, and *Lat. Vulgate* have rendered in this place by σμαραγδός *smaragdós*, *emerald*. But this is more properly the rendering of the next in order. The *carbuncle* and the *emerald* have in fact in some way become transposed in the *Greek* version.

4. EMERALD. Heb. נופך *nophek*. Gr. ἀσθαῖ. This gem is undoubtedly the

same with the ancient *smaragdós*, or *emerald*, one of the most beautiful of all the precious stones. It is characterised by a *bright green* color, with scarcely any mixture, though differing somewhat in degrees. The true *Oriental emerald* is now very scarce. The best that are at present accessible are from *Peru*. In the time of *Moses* they came from *India*.

5. SAPPHIRE. Heb. ספיר *sappir*. Gr. σάπφειρος *sapphiros*. The word is very nearly the same in all known languages, and as to the sapphire itself it is, after the diamond, the most valuable of the gems, exceeding all others in lustre and hardness. It is of a *sky-blue*, or *fine azure* color, in all the choicest specimens, though other varieties occur. Indeed among practical jewellers it is a name of wider application perhaps than that of any of the rest of the precious stones. *Pliny* says that in his time the best sapphires came from *Media*. At present they are found in greater or less perfection in nearly every country.

6. DIAMOND. Heb. יהלם *yahalom*, from הלם *halam*, *to beat, to smite upon*, so called from its extraordinary hardness, by which like a hammer it will beat to pieces any of the other sorts of stones. Thus the *Greeks* called the diamond ἀδάμας, *adamas*, from Gr. α, *not* and δαμαω, *damao*, *to subdue*, on account of its supposed *invincible hardness*. Accordingly *Pliny* says of diamonds, that 'they are found to resist a stroke on the anvil to such a degree that the iron itself gives way and the anvil is shattered to pieces.' This is no doubt exaggerated and fabulous, but it is sufficient to justify the propriety of the *Hebrew* name, that diamonds are *much harder* than other precious stones, and in this all are agreed. This quality of the diamond, together with its incomparable brilliancy, renders it by far the most valuable of all the gems. The Gr. here has ἵασπις *jaspis*, or *jasper*.

7. LIGURE. Heb. לשם *leshem*. Gr.

and an onyx, and a jasper: they shall be set in gold in their enclosings.

21 And the stones shall be with the names of the children of Israel, twelve, according to their names, like the engravings of a signet; every one with his name shall they be according to the twelve tribes.

22 ¶ And thou shalt make upon the breast-plate chains at the ends of wreathen work of pure gold.

23 And thou shalt make upon the breast-plate two rings of gold, and shalt put the two rings on the two ends of the breast-plate.

24 And thou shalt put the two wreathen chains of gold in the two rings which are on the ends of the breast-plate.

λίγυριον, *ligurion*. This is one of the most doubtful of the precious stones as to color. It is supposed to be closely related to the *hyacinth* (*jacinth*) of the moderns, which is a red strongly tinged with orange-yellow.

8. AGATE. Heb. שֶׁבַר *shebo*. Gr. ἀχάτης, *achates*, *agate*. This is a stone of a great variety of hues, which is thought by some to be identical with the *chrysopras*, and if so it is probably that a golden green was the predominant color.

9. AMETHYST. Heb. אֶחְלָמָה *ahlamah*. Gr. ἀμεθυστος, *amethystos*, from α, *not*, and μεθυστος, *drunken*, because wine drank from an amethyst cup was supposed by the ancients to prevent inebriation. The oriental amethyst is a transparent gem, the color of which seems to be composed of a strong blue and a deep red; and according as either prevails, affording different tinges of purple, and sometimes even fading to a rose color. It comes from Persia, Arabia, Armenia, and the East Indies.

10. BERYL. Heb. תַּרְשִׁישׁ *tarshish*. Gr. χρυσολίθος, *chrysolithos*. A pellucid gem of a sea or bluish green. But

25 And the other two ends of the two wreathen chains thou shalt fasten in the two ouches, and put them on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod before it.

26 ¶ And thou shalt make two rings of gold, and thou shalt put them upon the two ends of the breast-plate in the border thereof, which is in the side of the ephod inward.

27 And two other rings of gold thou shalt make, and shalt put them on the two sides of the ephod underneath, toward the fore-part thereof, over against the other coupling thereof, above the curious girdle of the ephod.

28 And they shall bind the breast-plate by the rings thereof unto the


if, as many mineralogists and critics suppose, the *beryl* is the same as the *chrysolite*, it is a gem of yellowish green color, and ranks at present among the *topazes*.

11. ONYX. Heb. שֹׁהַם *shoham*; called *onyx* from Gr. ονυξ, *onyx*, from its resemblance of its ground color to that lunated spot at the base of the human nail, which the Greek word signifies. It is a semi-pellucid stone of a fine flinty texture, of a waterish sky-colored ground, variegated with bands of white and brown, which run parallel to each other. It is here rendered by the Gr. βηρυλλιον, *beryllion*, *beryl*, from some apparent confusion in the order of the names. See Note on Gen. 2. 12.

12. JASPER. Heb. יַשְׁפֶּה *yashepheh*. Gr. ονυχιον, *onuchion*. The similarity of the Hebrew name has determined most critics to consider the *jasper* as the gem intended by this designation. This is a stone distinguished by such a vast variety of hues, that it is extremely hazardous to fix upon any one as its distinguishing color. The brown Egyptian variety is conjectured to have been the one selected for the Breast-plate.



The annexed cut, conformed to the usual model, will convey a tolerably correct idea of the general form and appearance of the Breast-plate. The English name we consider as unfortunately chosen. Pectoral, i. e. *breast-plate* is decidedly preferable. Josephus calls it *Essen*.



THE BREAST-PLATE.

21. *And the stones shall be with the names.* Heb. על שמות *al shemoth*, upon the names. The more natural and direct phraseology would be—‘the names shall be upon the stones,’ but the expression is idiomatic, and probably implies that the stones should be accompanied or distinguished by the names; or we may adopt the construction of Noldius (*De Heb. Partic. sub voc. על*) and all the ancient versions, and render it—‘the stones shall be according to the names of the children of Israel,’ which probably involves the complex idea of the stones corresponding with the names in number, and also of having the names actually sculptured upon them.

28. *Unto the rings of the ephod.* Of these two rings nothing was said in the account of the construction of the Ephod above; probably because the use of them would not so fully appear till the Breast-plate and its position came to

rings of the ephod with a lace of blue, that *it* may be above the curious girdle of the ephod, and that the breast-plate be not loosed from the ephod.

29 And Aaron shall bear the

be described as is done in the present context.

29. *Aaron shall bear the names, &c., in the breast-plate of judgment upon his heart.* The phrase 'upon his heart' is not properly to be understood in this connexion in a *physical* sense, as if equivalent to 'upon his breast,' 'upon his bosom.' This is not the usage of the Hebrew in regard to the word 'heart.' After a pretty thorough examination of the many hundreds of cases in which the term occurs in the sacred writers, we have not been able to find *a single instance*, apart from the present, in which it is unequivocally employed in a physiological sense, to denote that grand organ of the human body which anatomists call 'the heart.' The passage which comes nearest to such a sense is that in Is. 1. 5, 'The whole head is sick, and the whole *heart* faint.' Yet even here the metaphorical sense is predominant; for as the *sickness* is not corporeal, but moral, so the *members* affected are to be considered as equally figurative. According to the prevailing usage of Scripture, the *heart* is regarded as the seat of intelligence and emotion. The feelings of love, hope, fear, joy, sorrow, &c., are referred to the *heart*; and in the present case we cannot question that although as a matter of fact the Breast-plate was worn over the region of the *heart*, yet the dominant idea conveyed by the phrase is, that Aaron was to bear these names of the tribes *in his kind and affectionate remembrance* whenever he went into the holy place. The beautiful sculptured gems were to be *to him* a memorial or memento of the fact that the interests of the whole people were

names of the children of Israel in the breast-plate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy *place*, *p* for a memorial before the LORD continually.

P ver. 12.

committed to him as their representative, and that he should never cease to feel burdened in soul with this grave responsibility, especially whenever he was called to act in his capacity as *sacerdotal judge* of the chosen tribes. In this fact we are no doubt at liberty to read one very interesting feature of the typical intent of the jewelled Breast-plate. The priesthood of Aaron shadowed forth the infinitely greater and more glorious priesthood of Christ. In the execution of his office as the great High Priest of the Church, he was ordained to enter into the holy place, there to appear in the presence of God for us. This he has done. He ascended to heaven after his resurrection, that he might there complete the work he had begun on earth. On his heart are engraven the names of all his people, and not one of them is overlooked or forgotten. He presents them all before his Father, as the objects of his own kind and solicitous sympathy and care, and they are dear to the Father, because they are dear to the Son. As he thus bears these his jewels on his heart while they are toiling and travailing here below, so will he finally transfer them from his bosom to his head, making them to adorn his diadem forever in the kingdom of his glory.

But this does not forbid the supposition, that *in relation to God* the stones of the Breast-plate may have subserved still another purpose. Certain it is that the whole scope of the context leads us to view them as indicating *not only the subjects*, but also the *instruments*, of those *judicial decisions* about which they were employed. They were in some way made use of as a *medium of*

the oracular responses which the High Priest obtained by consultation from Jehovah in behalf of the Jewish people. But as this presents them in a distinct point of view, as intimately connected, if not absolutely identified, with the Urim and Thummim, we shall defer the sequel of our remarks on the Breast-plate till we come to the consideration of that very interesting but abstruse subject.

In the mean time, we cannot forbear presenting the reader with the following translated extract from the work of Bähr before mentioned, in relation to the joint symbolical uses of the Ephod and the Breast-plate.

‘The Ephod and the Hoshen or Pectoral, which formed the third general division of the High Priest’s vestments, and signified the *kingly dignity*, do not stand in subordinate relation the one to the other, so that the Hoshen was merely an appendage to the Ephod, but they are both treated in the original as independent articles, yet at the same time making together one whole. The dignity also which they represent, must be in some way of a two-fold nature, or which exhibits itself under a double aspect; and thus in fact was the *kingly dignity*, both among the Hebrews and all oriental antiquity conceived of, viz., as uniting in itself the two grand prerogatives of *lordship* and *judgment*. Thus, 1 Sam. 8. 5, 6, ‘And said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a *king to judge us* like all the nations. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a *king to judge us*: and Samuel prayed unto the Lord.’ So also 20, ‘That we also may be like all the nations; and that *our king may judge us*, and go out before us, and fight our battles.’ 2 Sam. 15. 4, ‘Absalom said moreover, Oh that I were *made judge* in the land, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me,

and I would do him justice!’ 1 Kings, 3. 9, ‘Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to *judge thy people*, that I may discern between good and bad: for who is able to *judge* this thy so great a people?’ So Artemidorus the Oneirocritic remarks, κρινειν το αρχειν ελεγον οι παλαιοι, the ancients said that reigning was judging. Now the *reigning dignity* is plainly indicated by the Ephod, inasmuch as we have already observed, that its distinguishing feature was the *shoulder-piece* (Gr. επωμης), and the *shoulder* both in sacred and profane antiquity is considered as the *seat of sovereignty*. Thus Isaiah says of the Messiah, ch. 9. 5, ‘And the *government* shall be upon his *shoulder*.’ So also according to an Indian myth, when the different castes came forth from the body of Brahma, *kings* and *warlike heroes* issued from the *shoulder*. That the same idea was familiar among the Romans would appear from the words of Pliny (Panegy. 10.), ‘Cum abunde expertus esset pater, quam bene humeris tuis sedet imperium,’ since (thy) father hath abundantly proved how well dominion sits upon thy shoulders. The symbolical import is the same when upon the shoulder of a statue of the Egyptian king Sesostris the inscription was read; Εγω τηνδε χωρην ὤμοισι τοισι ἐμοῖσι ἐκτησαμην, I have acquired this province by my shoulders. In accordance with this, the usual insignia of *ruling*, viz., sword and keys, were suspended from the shoulder. Thus, Is. 22. 22, ‘And the *key* of the house of David will I lay upon his *shoulder*; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.’ That the sword hung from the *shoulder* among the Greeks and Romans, will be seen by reference to Hom. Il. 2. 45. Lipsius in Tac. Annal. 1. 35. As to what relates to the *judicial prerogative*, we need not go beyond the designation given in the original to the Breast-plate, viz., חֹשֶׁן

30 ¶ And thou shalt put in the breast-plate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim; and they shall

q Lev. 8. 8. Numb. 27. 21. Deut. 33. 8. 1 Sam. 28. 6. Ezra, 2. 63. Neh. 7. 65.

חֹשֶׁן מִשְׁפָּט *hoshen mishpat*, breast-plate of judgment, to show its symbolical bearing.' *Symbol. des Mos. Cult.*, vol. II. p. 127—9. If this view of the subject be well founded, we think there is strong reason to believe, that the use of *epaulettes* as a badge of authority and imperatorial command is to be traced back through the line of past centuries to the Shoulder-piece of the ancient Ephod. This article of military accoutrement forms at any rate a subject of very curious historical interest, which might well demand a thorough investigation.

#### THE URIM AND THUMMIM.

30. Thou shalt put in the breast-plate of judgment the Urim and Thummim. Heb. אֲרִיִּים וְתֻמִּיִּים *urim ve-eth hattummim*, the Lights and the Perfections. Gr. τὴν ἐκδήλωσιν καὶ ἀληθειαν, *the manifestation and the truth*. Aq. 'Enlightenings and Certainities.' Sam. 'Elucidations and Perfections.' Syr. 'the Lucid and the Perfect.' Arab. 'Illuminations and Certainities.' Lat. Vulg. 'Doctrine and Verity.' Luth. 'Light and Right.' The Hebrew terms signify primarily *fires* or *lights*, and *perfections* or *truth*. *Perfection* and *truth* are in Scripture style virtually equivalent in import, because what is *perfected* is *truly* done, neither false, vain, or *unexecuted*, but *accomplished*. The sacred writers, therefore, who often conjoin synonymous terms, have brought these epithets together in several instances, as Josh. 24. 14, 'Fear the Lord and serve him *in perfection and truth* (בְּתִמְיָם וּבִאֱמֶת) *betummim ubeëmeth*;' i.e. really and perfectly. Thus also 'according to truth,' Rom. 2. 2, is the same as *most certainly to be*

be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the LORD: and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the LORD continually.

*accomplished*; wherefore *εργον* *work* or *deed*, and *ἀληθεια* *truth*, 1 John, 3. 18, are synonymous; 'My little children let us not love in word or in tongue, but in *deed* and in *truth*.' That the divine oracles were *perfect* or *truth* no one will doubt who reflects a moment on their source, and who recalls the expression of the Psalmist, Ps. 119. 130, 'The entrance (Gr. ἐκδήλωσις, *the manifestation*) of thy word giveth light.' Others, however, understand the phrase as an instance of *hendiadys*, denoting under a double denomination one and the same thing, or as equivalent to *most perfect light* or *illumination*. The same figure occurs Deut. 16. 18. Mat. 4. 16. comp. with Job, 10. 21. John, 3. 5.

In the Urim and Thummim, a subject of great interest, and at the same time of great difficulty, opens upon us. Various and voluminous have been the speculations of learned men in respect to what is meant by these objects, and the precise manner in which they were made instrumental in obtaining oracular responses from God. We cannot, in consistency with our general plan of exposition, avoid entering somewhat minutely into the investigation of both these points; and yet we are unable to assure ourselves of presenting the evidence under either head in such a light as to command the entire assent of our readers to the resulting conclusions. Should we fail of success in this, we shall at least but share the defeat of most of our predecessors in the same field of enquiry, yet we are not without hope that our usual method of rigid philological analysis and parallel induction may conduct us to results of a somewhat satisfactory character;

and as this is the last point connected with the Hebrew ritual which will require a very elaborate discussion, we shall with more confidence bespeak the reader's indulgence for a train of remarks more than usually extended.

I. The first question respecting the Urim and Thummim regards their *nature*. What were they? Certain it is, that we find no previous mention of them; no order given for their construction; and no intimation that these names were ever applied to any of the articles which Moses *was* directed to make. The obscurity in which the subject is involved in the sacred text, together with the infinite conjectures to which it has given rise, has led some commentators to the conclusion that the matter is, and was intended to be, one of inscrutable mystery, which it is vain to think of penetrating. In this they virtually subscribe to the opinion of the learned Kimchi, who remarks, that 'he is on the safest side who frankly confesses his ignorance; so that we seem to need a priest to stand up with Urim and Thummim to teach us what the Thummim were.' The question, however, may be properly narrowed down to a single point, which perhaps admits of solution, viz., were the Urim and Thummim identical with the stones of the Breast-plate, or something distinct from them? On this question the mass of commentators divide. Several of the Jewish Rabbis among the ancients, and Spencer, Michaelis, Jahn, and Gesenius among the moderns contend that they were something entirely distinct from the Pectoral, and deposited within the pocket or bag made of its folds. Some of the earlier Hebrew doctors say that what is called the Urim and Thummim were nothing else than an inscription upon a plate of gold of the Tetragrammaton or four-lettered name of God (יהוה *Yehovah*), by the mystic virtue of which the High Priest was enabled to pronounce *luminous* and *perfect* ora-

cles to the people. But this is a conceit which may be safely passed to the account of the wild and childish figments of the Talmudical Rabbins, which it would require the same weakness to refute as to adopt.

A theory coming from a far higher source, and yet almost equally extravagant, is that proposed by Spencer in his voluminous and in many respects valuable work on the Laws of the Hebrews. He supposes that the Urim were the same with the Teraphim, and that they were nothing more than small divining images, put into the lining of the Breast-plate, which were miraculously made to speak with an articulate voice and utter oracles from God. But it would be scarcely possible to have introduced into the service of the sanctuary any thing more directly idolatrous and pagan in its tendencies than such a device; and when we consider how carefully the whole Mosaic system guards against that propensity to image-worship which the Israelites evidently brought with them from Egypt, we cannot but be surprised that a theory so utterly abhorrent to the genius of Judaism should have been proposed by a Christian writer. It is but justice, however, to the erudite Spencer to say, that he is far more successful in urging objections to the common theories than in establishing his own. His dissertation on the Urim and Thummim is preeminently able and learned, notwithstanding the obvious error of his main position, nor is it by any means an easy task to dispose of the philological and critical arguments by which he aims to prove, that the objects so called, whatever they were, were something *put into* the lining or folds of the Breast-plate, instead of being externally attached to it. We are on the whole constrained to yield a qualified assent to the force of his reasonings on this head, while at the same time the sequel will show, that this admission is per-

fectly consistent with maintaining the main view which he is induced to reject.

We may observe, moreover, while adverting to the work of Spencer, that we are firmly of opinion that much more weight is due to the grand idea pervading it, of the conformity in many features of the Jewish to the Egyptian system of worship, than has usually been conceded. Certain it is that within the last fifty years new sources of evidence have been opened upon this subject, by which the state of the question has been entirely altered, from one of *argument* to one of *fact*. These sources are found in the ancient paintings and sculptures of Egypt, which exhibit with great minuteness of detail not only the usages of that extraordinary nation in peace and war, but portray also the rites and ceremonies of their religion, with the various acts performed, the utensils employed, the dresses and ornaments worn, by the Egyptian priesthood in the services of their gods. The result of the comparison will set the question of inter-conformity between the two systems at rest. It is impossible to deny that the most remarkable similarities obtain in the ceremonial observances and the forms and apparatus of divine worship established among the two people. The reader has only to turn back to a preceding page, and compare the cut of an Egyptian Ark borne by priests with Moses's account of the Ark of the Covenant and the manner in which it was carried, for a striking specimen of this coincidence. How the coincidence originated—whether it was accidental; or whether the Jews borrowed from the Egyptians, or the Egyptians from the Jews; or whether both are to be traced to a common origin in the patriarchal practice—is a question not easily decided, though for ourselves we consider the latter supposition as by far the most probable. We have little question that an antediluvian ritual existed, some of

the main features of which were transmitted, through the family of Noah, to all the different nations of antiquity, and which are still traceable in their various superstitions, though sadly deformed, defaced, and perverted by the foul admixture of corruptions subsequently introduced. In giving the Levitical system to the chosen people, God was pleased to retain, purified from their idolatrous associations, many of the peculiarities which marked the Egyptian worship, not because they *were* Egyptian, or because God would unduly consult the weaknesses and prejudices of the chosen people, but because they were primitive and patriarchal, common in their elementary forms to all nations, and perhaps originally of divine institution. This we consider a view of the subject sufficient to account for all the facts, not liable to any serious objection, and one which will afford us essential aid in the explication of the present and many other features of the Hebrew ritual.

The other and much more probable opinion relative to the Urim and Thummim is, that they were in fact identical with the stones of the Breast-plate, but called by this name from the *instrumental uses* which they were made to subserve in the symbolical economy of the priesthood. This opinion, which is held by Josephus, Philo, and most of the ancient Jewish doctors, and has been generally adopted by the moderns, is supported by the following considerations:

(1.) If the words Urim and Thummim be regarded as *epithets*, rather than *names*, applied to the stones, nothing could be more appropriate. From their intrinsic properties of splendor, brilliancy, and *luminousness*, they might very properly be termed *Lights* and *Perfections*, an expression supposed by many to be grammatically equivalent to *most perfect lights*. This is the view of Braunius, who says that not

only were precious stones to be employed, but they were to be the most *shining* and *perfect* of the kind. Accordingly, v. 30 may be considered as in fact an emphatic repetition of v. 29, intimating that the work commanded should be executed in the most exact and scrupulous manner; that such stones should be provided and so exquisitely polished and set, as to present the most brilliant appearance, and be entitled to the significant designation of *Lights* and *Perfections*.

(2.) If the Urim and Thummim were not the same with the gems of the Breast-plate, it is wholly inexplicable that the sacred narrative gives us no account of them. While every other part of the ritual is described with the most scrupulous minuteness, as if not a pin of the Tabernacle or a thread of the priestly garments were to be made without express direction, how comes it that nothing is said of an article which, in obtaining responses from God, was absolutely indispensable and which was in every respect among the most important items of the whole apparatus? The silence of the historian, therefore, on this point must be regarded as strong evidence that the Urim and Thummim were identical with the stones.

(3.) It will be observed upon comparing Ex. 39. 8—21, with Lev. 8. 8, that in the description of the Breast-plate, given in the former, while the rows of stones are mentioned, nothing is said of the Urim and Thummim; while in the latter, which speaks of the investiture of Aaron with the pontifical habit, the Urim and Thummim are mentioned, but the stones are passed over in silence. What inference more obvious than that these objects were in fact one and the same?

In order to concentrate still farther all possible collateral light on this point, we shall adduce the various passages in which the Urim and Thummim are mentioned throughout the Scriptures.

Lev. 8. 8, 'And he put the breast-plate upon him; also *he put in the breast-plate the Urim and Thummim.*'

Num. 27. 21. 'And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him *after the judgment of Urim* before the Lord.'

Deut. 33. 8, 'And of Levi he said, *Let thy Thummim and Urim be with thy holy one.*'

1 Sam. 28. 6, 'And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, *nor by Urim*, nor by prophets.'

Ezra, 2. 63, and Neh. 7. 65, 'And the Tirshatha said unto them, that they should not eat of the most holy things, *till there stood up a priest with Urim and with Thummim.*'

In neither of these passages is the language any more decisive than the text before us of the question at issue. The first of them does indeed speak very expressly of the Urim and Thummim being *put into* the Breast-plate, and this also would seem to be the unequivocal sense of the words in the verse upon which we are now commenting; 'Thou shalt *put in the breast-plate of judgment* (נָתַת אֶל חֹשֶׁן הַמִּשְׁפָּט *nathatta el hoshen hammishpat*) the Urim and Thummim.' Chal. בַּחֹשֶׁן *bahoshen*, *in or into the breast-plate*. The phraseology is precisely similar to that Ex. 25. 16, 21, 'And thou shalt *put into the ark* (נָתַת אֶל אֲרוֹן הָאָרֶץ *nathatta el ha'aron*) the testimony,' &c. Nor is it by any means unusual to find the particle אֶל *el* interchanged with ב *b*, in the sense of *in, into*. Thus Gen. 49. 29, 'Bury me with my fathers *in* (אֶל) the cave that is in field, of Ephron.' Ps. 104. 22, 'The sun ariseth, they gather themselves together, and lay them down *in* (אֶל) their dens.' 1 Sam. 10. 22, 'And the Lord answered, Behold, he hath hid himself *among* (אֶל) the stuff.' It would seem that in point of local position the Urim and Thummim bore the same re-

lation to the Breast-plate which the Tables of Testimony did to the Ark of the Covenant; and accordingly R. Levi ben Gerson in Buxtorf remarks thus upon the passage before us; 'Because Moses, after inserting the precious stones in the Pectoral, was commanded to put the Urim and Thummim into the same, we cannot help believing that these were something which Moses put into the Pectoral in the same manner in which he put tables into the Ark, inasmuch as he expresses both by the same phrase (נתת אל) ?

With this philological evidence before us we know not how to avoid the conclusion, that the Urim and Thummim were actually *put into* the fold or lining of the Breast-plate, and the only question is, how this idea can be reconciled with the above position, that the Urim and Thummim and the precious stones were identical. The single solution which, as far as we see, *can* reconcile two positions so apparently in conflict is, that the stones, instead of being *outwardly* attached to the embroidered work of the Pectoral, and thus made visible to the beholder, were in fact placed upon its *inside*, or in other words lodged *within* the lining of the Breast-plate, and entirely out of sight to any eye but that of Omniscience. We do not perceive that there is any thing in the text, however rigidly scanned, which necessarily requires us to understand the attachment of the stones as *external* to the Breast-plate, nor can we resist the belief that the main use of the Pectoral was that of a *bag* or *pocket* in which *something* was to be deposited. If it served merely as a *ground* for supporting the precious stones, the greater part of it would necessarily be concealed by them, and what then were the use of such an exquisite and costly material? Would not a coarser fabric or a metallic plate have better answered the purpose? Rabbi Solomon, as quoted by Buxtorf,

remarks that 'both in the command to place the inscribed stones upon the shoulder of Aaron, and in the account of its execution, the preposition על *al*, upon, occurs in order to teach us that they were placed *exteriorly* to the Ephod, whereas in speaking of the stones of the Pectoral the preposition ב *b* or אל *el*, in, is uniformly employed, as Ex. 28. 17, מלאה בו *millitha bo*, thou shalt fill in it. Ex. 39. 10, וימלאו בו *va-yemalleu bo*, and they filled in it. As to the subjoined phrase על לבו *al libbo*, upon his heart, that is used to signify that they were to be hidden.'

But it is not by philological considerations alone that we deem this view of the subject sustained. We have already adverted to the fact of a very remarkable coincidence between the religious rites and usages of the Egyptians and Israelites. The extent to which these affinities exist, as shown by the monumental sculptures and paintings of Egypt, can be but imperfectly appreciated by those who are not somewhat conversant with the works containing the fac-similes of these wonderful remains. Nearly every article of the sacred costume prescribed by God to Moses has its counterpart in the pictured dresses of the Egyptian priests; and in regard to the objects now under consideration and some other peculiarities of the Mosaic system, we are strongly inclined to the opinion, that so few particulars are given, because *it is taken for granted that they were sufficiently known before*. Nahmanides observes that whenever the mention of any of the sacred things is introduced by the use of the definite or emphatic article ה *h*, the, it implies that it was something previously designated or known. Thus it is ordered in general terms, 'they shall make *an* ark,' 'thou shalt make *a* table,' 'thou shalt make *a* candlestick,' &c., but when we come to the text before us it is said, 'thou shalt put in the breast-plate of judgment *the* Urim and



Thummim,' as something which would *of course* be adequately understood from other sources. In like manner, says he, we are told, in Gen. 2. 24, that 'God placed *the cherubims* (הַכְרֻבִּים *hakerubim*) at the east of the garden of Eden,' as something too well known to need a particular description. Now if we could obtain evidence that any similar usage prevailed among the ancient Egyptians, especially in the matter of delivering oracles, it would obviously go far to countenance the idea, that the jewelled appendage to the Pectoral was a matter with which both Moses and the people had already become familiar in the land of their bondage. By a singular fortuity it so happens, that we are possessed of just the evidence that we want in relation to this point. Not only do the Egyptian paintings exhibit the pectoral ornament answering to the Jewish *hoshen* or *breast-plate*, but in two of the Greek historians, viz., Diodorus Siculus and Ælian we find the express record which Mr. Wilkinson has embodied in the following passage (Man. and Cust. of Anc. Egypt, vol. 2. p. 26.), 'When a case was brought for trial, it was customary for the arch-judge to put a golden chain around his neck, to which was suspended a small figure of *Truth* or ornamented with precious stones. This was in fact a representation of the goddess who was worshipped under the double character of *truth* and *justice*, and whose name, *Thmei*, appears to have been the origin of the Hebrew *thummim*, a word according to the Septuagint translation, implying *truth*, and bearing a further analogy in its plural termination. And what makes it more remarkable is, that the chief priest of the Jews, who, before the election of a king, was also the judge of the nation, was alone entitled to wear this honorary badge; and the *thummim* of the Hebrews, like the Egyptian figure, was studded with precious stones.' It is

moreover affirmed by the traveller Peter du Val that he saw a mummy at Cairo, round the neck of which was a chain having a golden plate suspended from it, which lay on the breast of the person, and on which was engraved the figure of a bird. This person was supposed to have been one of the supreme judges; and in all likelihood the bird was the emblem of truth, justice, or innocence.

This is certainly a remarkable set of coincidences, and the force of it in the argument is not to be weakened by the intimation, that this official badge was worn by *civil* magistrates among the Egyptians. The truth is, the religion of that people was so interwoven with their laws and government that their *kings* were of the *sacerdotal* order, and the *judicial* functions were exercised by the *priests*. As in nearly all the governments of that early period of the world, so among the Egyptians, the people were taught to regard their rulers as clothed with *divine* authority, as the immediate delegates and vicegerents of the gods; and especially in the administration of justice, it was their object to beget the universal belief that their decisions were in fact *divine oracles*. As scarcely any thing of moment in private life was undertaken without consulting oracles, so especially was this the case in matters of government. It was of the highest importance that the impression should prevail that it was done with the concurrence of the gods.

Now that precious stones were instrumentally employed in this kind of divination which had respect to the administration of justice, or the delivery of *judicial oracles*, is very largely and lucidly proved by Daubuz in his invaluable 'Commentary on the Apocalypse,' ch. 21, when treating of the twelve foundations of precious stones of the heavenly Jerusalem. By a learned array of citations from ancient au-

thors he shows that a peculiar mystic virtue was attributed to gems as amulets and charms, and as a medium of converse in general with demons and spirits of the invisible world. Thus Pliny says that the *jasper* was worn every where over the East for amulets; and of the *amethyst* he remarks, that according to popular belief if the name of the sun and moon be written on this kind of stones, and they be suspended from the neck by the feathers of certain birds, they will resist the effect of poison, and avert hail, locusts, &c.; and the same virtue he ascribes to *emeralds* provided they have the figure of an eagle or scarabæus inscribed upon them. We may agree with him in the remark that such things cannot well be written without exciting the contempt and derision of the human race; but however vain were such notions, it is clear that they influenced the practice of the ancients; and they enable us better to understand the reason and origin of their sacred symbolical use. Epiphanius also, in speaking of the gems on the High Priest's Breast-plate, takes notice of the virtues assigned to them by the magicians. Of the *emerald* he says it is accounted to possess a prognosticating power; of the *jasper*, that it drives away spectres and delusions which were attributed to demons; and the same of the *ligure* and *hyacinth*. As therefore these magical and mystical notions respecting the virtues of gems did beyond question prevail among the ancient pagans, especially the Egyptians and the Chaldeans; as they were undoubtedly employed in their *judicial* and *oracular* transactions, we cannot but deem it altogether probable that there was a certain degree of assimilation, or latent inter-relation, between the Hebrew Breast-plate with its *Urim* and *Thummim*, and the jewelled collar or pectoral of the Egyptian judge. But although thus related in general as a medium of *oracular* revelation, yet they

would of course differ according to the different scope and genius of their respective institutions. While with the Egyptians these sacred instruments were subservient to the grossest superstition, to magic, and idolatry, with the Hebrews they were instituted for a purpose directly the reverse. They were designed to call them away from the practice of all unhallowed divinations and auguries, and fix their dependence upon the true God. That people were indeed permitted to avail themselves of an oracle on great emergencies; but that oracle was *divine*. It was the true God, *Jehovah*, omniscient, omnipotent, and infallible. And though he was pleased, in accommodation to their mental condition and capacities to retain and incorporate into his ritual certain usages, to which they had been familiar in other connexions, yet they were henceforth *hallowed* usages, and never to be associated with any idolatrous sentiments or aims. The use of precious stones by those that ministered at heathen temples was nothing but deceit, delusion, and fraud. They were instrumental in uttering oracles which were enigmatical, ambiguous, and false. In God's worship they were *Urim* and *Thummim*, *clearness* and *certainty*, *light* and *perfection*, lacking nothing in explicitness of enunciation, nothing in truth of accomplishment. 'To show how all this is suitable,' says Daubuz, 'to the principles of the symbolical language, by which alone the true notion and full force of the word *Urim* is to be understood, we need only to remember that God was the king and ruler of Israel, and that his *oracles* were the special orders and commands which he gave to that people to govern and guide them. Now all kind of government, according to the style of those ages, which were acquainted with symbolical notions, was represented by *light*; because the lights or luminaries direct and show the way, and by con-

sequence govern men, who otherwise should not know what to do or whither to go. The word *thummim* joined to the *urim*, and showing this *light* to be *true* and *perfect*, implied that whatsoever God should by the *urim* foretel, would certainly come to pass. So that when God gave his *urim*, or *lights of direction*, to the Israelites, it was in order to bring to *perfection* all those counsels which he then discovered to them. It was upon this account that Christ is called, John, 8. 12, 'the *light* of the world,' and also, John, 14. 6, 'the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*.' For these titles signify his dominion and power to rule all the world; and he is the *Urim* and *Thummim*, the disposer of the *oracles* of God to guide and rule men, and to bring to *perfection* all the mystery of God, which is to bring men to eternal life. Hence in the New Jerusalem, wherein that mystery is *perfected*, he is with the Father the *Luminary* thereof. So that this New Jerusalem being founded or begun upon the *oracles* and *light* of the apostles of Jesus Christ, shall be completed by having therein the great *Urim* and *Thummim*, which gives *light* to all that are therein.' This New Jerusalem state, therefore, is one in which all the will, counsel, and promises of God from the beginning of the world are to be *perfected*. It is in that glorious state that their accomplishment is to result; but more especially those which have been made from the beginning of the Gospel dispensation by the apostles of the *Lamb*, who laid the first foundation of an universal church, and have consequently their names written on the symbols of that foundation.

We have enlarged thus fully in the preceding train of remark on the origin and primitive notions of the *Urim* and *Thummim*, not only on account of its intrinsic importance, but also in order to gain still stronger confirmation of the view advanced above in relation to their

identity with the precious stones and their true position in the Breast-plate. From an attentive consideration of the whole, we cannot but deem the inference very fair, that the gems, though perhaps permanently attached to the Pectoral, were yet placed in the *inside* of its folds when doubled, and thus in a still more emphatic sense borne 'upon the heart' of the High Priest. Yet as we cannot claim an entire certainty for this explanation we have represented the Breast-plate in the preceding cut as having the form and appearance usually ascribed to it. The matter is left to the enlightened judgment of the reader.

II. We have now to devote a few sentences to the discussion of the *manner* in which responses were given to the consultations made by the High Priest through the medium of the *Urim* and *Thummim*. And here the cloud, in which a remote antiquity has enveloped the question, is made still denser by the mists of conflicting conjectures. Among the Rabbinical writers there is a pretty general agreement as to the *occasions* on which those consultations were resorted to, viz., that they were of a *public* and not of a *private* nature. As the High Priest appeared before God in such cases with the names of all the twelve tribes on his Breast-plate, so they suppose that the counsel sought must be sought in the name and on the behalf of *all* the tribes, as having relation to interests which concerned them all; as for instance matters of peace and war, the election of rulers, the duties of the king on special emergencies, &c. But as to the precise *mode* of the responses, their diversities of opinion show that they were as little furnished with a clue to it as ourselves. The prevalent belief seems to have been, that the letters engraved on the precious stones were effected in some extraordinary manner, so that the dimness or lustre, depression or elevation, of the successive letters composing the

31 ¶ And thou shalt make the robe of the ephod all of blue.

r ch. 39. 22.

answer enabled the High Priest to read the response in, or reflected from, his Breast-plate. But this in most cases would have been impossible, as the names of the twelve sons of Jacob do not contain all the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, nor can we conceive how the letters should have been raised or illuminated in such order as to convey an intelligible answer. A far more probable opinion is, that the Urim and Thummim were merely a *requisite circumstance* in the consultation; that they simply put the High Priest into a condition to receive responses, and that these responses when duly sought were given in an audible voice from between the Cherubim. This seems supported by the fact, that this method of obtaining the divine response is described as 'asking at the mouth of the Lord.' 'Whatever was the precise medium through which the response was conveyed, the mode in which the priest acted is sufficiently plain. When any national emergency arose for which the law had made no provision, the High Priest arrayed himself in his Breast-plate and pontifical vestments, and went into the holy place, and standing close before the vail, but not entering within it, stated the question or difficulty, and received an answer. Several instances will occur of this manner of consulting the Lord. It is an opinion which has at least the tacit sanction of Scripture, that the mode of consulting the Lord by Urim and Thummim only subsisted under the theocracy, and while the Tabernacle still remained. Spencer strongly urges that the Urim and Thummim were essentially connected with the theocratic government of the Hebrews. While the Lord was their immediate governor and king, it was necessary that they should be enabled to consult

32 And there shall be an hole in the top of it, in the midst thereof: it shall have a binding of woven

him on important matters, and obtain his directions on occasions of difficulty. This method was also established for the purpose of consulting God in matters that concerned the common interest of the entire nation. On both these grounds the oracle might well cease when the theocracy terminated by the kingdom becoming hereditary in the person and family of Solomon; and still more, when the division of the nation into two kingdoms at his death rendered the interests of the nation no longer common. This is but an hypothesis: but it is certain that there are no traces in the sacred books of consulting the Lord by Urim and Thummim from the time of the erection to the demolition of Solomon's Temple: and that it did not afterwards exist is on all hands allowed.' *Pict. Bible.*

#### THE ROBE OF THE EPHOD.

31, 32. *Thou shalt make the robe of the ephod, &c.* This is a garment distinct from any that has yet been mentioned. It is called the 'robe of the ephod,' simply because it was worn immediately under it. Its Hebrew name is מַעֲלִיץ *me'il*, rendered in the Gr. *υποδυστηχιον*, an under-garment reaching down to the feet. Vulg. 'Tunic of the Ephod.' Arab. 'A rain-shedding cloak.' Luth. 'A silk robe.' Belg. 'A mantle.' Jun. and Trem. 'Pallium, a cloak.' The *me'il* was a distinguishing priestly vestment, and therefore Christ appears, Rev. 1. 13, 'clothed with a garment down to the feet (*υποδυστηχιον*),' to show himself the Great High Priest of the church. It was a long linen gown of sky blue color, reaching to the middle of the leg. It was all of one piece, and so formed as to be put on, not like other garments which are open in front, but like a surplice, over the head, having a hole at

work round about the hole of it, as it were the hole of an habergeon, that it be not rent.

the top for the head to pass through, which was strongly hemmed round with a binding or welt to prevent it from rending, and with openings or arm-holes in the sides in place of sleeves. Round its lower border were tassels made of blue, purple, and scarlet, in the form of pomegranates, interspersed with small gold bells, in order to make a noise when the High Priest went into or came out from the holy place, the reason of which is given below. We are not in-

33 ¶ And *beneath*, upon the hem of it thou shalt make pomegranates of blue, and of purple, and of scar-

formed of the exact number of the pomegranates and bells. The Rabbinical writers are mostly unanimous in saying, there were 72 in all, which is doubtless as probable as any other conjecture on the subject. It will be observed, that while the body of the Robe was entirely of blue, this ornamental appendage in the skirts was richly dyed of variegated hues, and must have rendered the whole a vestment of exquisite beauty.




THE ROBE OF THE EPHOD.

33. *Thou shalt make pomegranates.* רִמּוֹן *rimmon*. The term 'pomegranate' is compounded of *poma*, *apple*, and *granata*, *grained*, from its resemblance, when opened, to an *apple full of grain*. It grows wild in Palestine, and in other parts of Syria, as well as in Persia, Arabia, Egypt, and the southern parts of Europe, and in some portions of our own country. The fruit is the size of an orange, flattened at the end like an apple; and when cultivated is of a beautiful color and highly grateful flavor. The rind is at first green; but in August

and September when the fruit is ripe, it assumes a brownish-red color, becomes thick and hard, yet easily broken. The inside of the pomegranate is of a bright pink, with skinny partitions like those of the orange, filled with a subacid juice and a great multitude of white and purplish red seeds. The flower, which is of a scarlet color, is peculiarly beautiful, and it is probably to the flower that allusion is had, Cant. 4. 3, where the royal bridegroom compares the cheeks of his bride to a 'piece of pomegranate,' though others

understand by this a *section* of the fruit itself, the cheeks being called in the Talmudic language, *the pomegranates of the face*. The annexed cut will give an idea of the form of the fruit and flower of this plant, both which are among the most striking objects of the vegetable world.



THE POMEGRANATE.

The Pomegranate abounds more particularly in Syria and the ancient Assyria, where it was held sacred and entered into the symbols of the heathen worship, as is plainly to be inferred from its giving name to an idolatrous temple, 2 Kings, 5. 18, called 'the house of Rimmon,' i. e. the Pomegranate. In Persia the heads of sceptres and honorary staves were formed in the shape of a Pomegranate. It was also held sacred in Egypt; and in all countries where it was not to be found, the poppy, which also abounds in seeds, was chosen in its stead. Both were dedicated by the pagans to the *generative* powers, their numerous seeds rendering them an apt emblem of *prolific properties*. Hence at marriages the bride was crowned with a chaplet in which were inserted the flowers of pomegranates and poppies as an omen of *fruitfulness*. As then the idea of *fruitful increase* is prominent among the symbolical notions attached to this plant and its fruit, there is perhaps ample ground for the suggestion, that this singular appurtenance to the High Priest's dress, in conjunction with the bells, was designed to intimate that the

*sound* of the gospel should not be in vain; that wherever the *sound* of the doctrine of Christ and the apostles should come, then it should *bear fruit*, or that churches should be gathered bringing forth the *fruits* of righteousness; the *preaching* of the gospel should be the means of begetting a spiritual progeny zealous of *good works*. The remarks of Prof. Edwards are too pertinent to this point not to be cited in the present connexion. 'The golden bells on the Ephod, by their precious matter and pleasant sound do well represent the good profession that the saints make; and the pomegranates the fruit they bring forth. And as in the hem of the (robe of the) Ephod, bells and pomegranates were constantly connected, as is once and again observed,—'a golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate'—so it is in the true saints. Their good *profession*, and their good *fruit*, do constantly accompany one another. The fruit they bring in life answers the pleasant sound of their profession.' *Treat. on Affect*, Part III. p. 395.—  
¶ Of blue, purple, scarlet, &c. Although the body of this garment was of

let, round about the hem thereof; and bells of gold between them round about:

34 A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, upon the hem of the robe round about.

35 And it shall be upon Aaron, to minister: and his sound shall be

one uniform color, a beautiful blue, yet the skirts were ornamented with this parti-colored fringe-work, wrought somewhat like the silken balls, or ball-tassels, of modern upholstery, into the shape of the fruit here mentioned.—

¶ *Bells of gold.* Of the suggesting origin of this part of the dress of the High Priest it is difficult to give any account. That bells were not unknown in the costume of the East is evident from the Targum on Est. 6. 10, where Ahasuerus says to Haman ‘Go to my wardrobe, and take one of my best purple cloaks, and of the best silk vests, with gems at the four corners of it, and *golden bells and pomegranates hanging round about.*’ Michaelis conjectures that the Oriental kings of that period were accustomed to wear little bells upon some part of their robes in order to give notice that that they were near by, and that the people might retire. Hence perhaps the use of bells as a symbol of the reverence due to holy places. This idea is favored by the strong language, v. 35, where the punishment of death is threatened upon the neglect of this ceremony; which would seem to imply that as in the etiquette of an Eastern court, no one would rush rudely, or without some kind of annunciation, into the presence of the sovereign, so the High Priest was not to be guilty of the irreverence of approaching the Oracle without some kind of signal of his coming. Another use of this appendage of the mantle, as inferred from Ecclus. 45. 7-9, was, that the people collected in the court around the sanctuary might

heard when he goeth in unto the holy place before the LORD, and when he cometh out, that he die not.

36 ¶ And thou shalt make a plate of pure gold, and grave upon it like the engravings of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

† ch. 39. 30. Zech. 14. 20.

be admonished of the High Priest’s entrance into the Holy Place, and so unite their prayers with his incense offering, ‘An everlasting covenant he made with him (Aaron), and gave him the priesthood among the people; he beautified him with comely ornaments, and clothed him with a robe of glory. He put upon him perfect glory; and strengthened him with rich garments, with breeches, with a long robe, and the ephod. And he compassed him with pomegranates, and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made that might be heard in the temple, for a memorial to the children of his people.’ If this be well founded, and the sound of the bells had principal reference to the people, to remind them of the proper spirit and deportment to be observed on the occasion, then it may be suggested that the phrase, ‘that he die not,’ is perhaps to be understood not of Aaron, but to be rendered impersonally, ‘that one die not,’ ‘that there be no dying,’ i. e. that no one may presumptuously lay aside the becoming reverence and thus expose himself to death. The original will no doubt admit of this construction, but whether it be the true one, we are not prepared to decide.

#### THE GOLDEN PLATE AND MITRE.

36. *Thou shalt make a plate of pure gold, &c.* Heb. *צִיִּץ* *tzitz*. Gr. *πεταλον*, *petal*, *leaf*. Vulg. ‘Lamina,’ *plate*. Arab. ‘Fillet.’ Luth. ‘Forehead-plate.’ The original word *צִיִּץ* *tzitz*, from

צִיֵּץ *tzutz*, to flourish, is generally understood to signify a flower, and the Greek rendering *petal* would seem to be founded upon this sense, implying either that the plate was itself of the form of a flower, or was curiously wrought with flower-work. Such also was plainly the opinion of Josephus, who gives a minute description of the particular kind of flower or calyx which was figured upon the plate. Rosenmüller, however, contends that this rendering in this place is founded upon a false interpretation of צִיֵּץ, which does not, he says, legitimately signify a flower, nor has it any relation to flowers or flower-work, but properly denotes something glistening, radiant, effulgent, and is here applied to the plate on the Mitre, from the flashing splendors which beamed from it. But the ideas of *flourishing* and of *emitting splendor* are somewhat closely related in all languages, as nothing is more common with us for instance than to speak of the brightness or splendid hues of flowers, and from the *usus loquendi* of the term it cannot at all be questioned that the dominant sense of צִיֵּץ is that of flowers or flowering plants. Yet it is very possible that the two ideas of *efflorescence* and *shining* may be combined in this passage, especially if we suppose, as we think was undoubtedly the case, that some kind of floral ornament was wrought upon the glistening gold plate of the Mitre. In describing the execution of this order, Ex. 39. 30, it is said, 'they made the plate of the holy crown (צִיֵּץ נֹר הַקֹּדֶשׁ *tzitz nizer hakkodesh*) of pure gold,' &c., where נֹר *nizer* comes from a verb signifying to separate, and hence denoting a crown as a mark of separation or distinction. So also the original word for mitre occurs Job, 29. 14, where it is rendered 'diadem,' leading us to the inference that the sacerdotal mitre is closely allied with the kingly crown. Thus too Lev. 8. 9, 'and he put the

mitre upon his head; also upon the mitre, even upon his fore-front, did he put the golden plate, the holy crown; as the Lord commanded Moses.' In like manner we find it said Ps. 132. 18, 'upon himself shall his crown flourish (צִיֵּץ יִצְיִץ *yatzitz nizro*).' Here it is difficult to account for the idea of a crown's flourishing, except upon the supposition of some kind of floral appendages being connected with it in the mind of the writer; and this might have arisen from the fact, that the earliest crown was merely a chaplet, garland, or wreath bound around the head; or from the beautiful wrought flower-work on the priestly Mitre of Aaron. But whatever uncertainty may otherwise envelope the subject, this is clear beyond question, that the Plate was the principal part of the Mitre, and that the badges of the priestly are closely interwoven with those of the kingly dignity in the appointed vesture of the Jewish pontiff. For this fact a twofold reason may be assigned. In the first place, the entire nation of Israel was in a sense concentrated in the person of the High Priest, their head and representative. It was the high prerogative of this favored people to be chosen as a 'royal priesthood,' a 'kingdom of priests,' and the unity of the nation, in this exalted character, was made visible in the person of him who was ordained as their supreme dignitary. Nothing therefore would be more natural or appropriate than that corresponding symbols or badges of this twofold distinction should appear on the head-dress of the High Priest, as we here learn to have been the fact. Indeed the Jewish tradition amplifies this idea somewhat, and affirms a threefold dignity of their race, which they say was indicated by a triplet of crowns, viz., the crown of the priesthood, the crown of the kingdom, and the crown of the law.—Secondly, this conjunction of sacerdotal and royal symbols in the




37 And thou shalt put it on a blue lace, that it may be upon the mi-

tre; upon the fore-front of the mitre it shall be.

Mitre was intended to serve as a typical intimation of the union of these two offices in the person of Christ, who

was to sit as 'a priest upon his throne,' being made a *priest* after the order of Melchizedek, *king* of righteousness.



THE GOLDEN PLATE OF THE MITRE.

¶ Like the engravings of a signet. It is probable that the Jewish writers are correct in supposing that the letters were not cut or grooved into the plate, but were rather *embossed* or *made to stand in relief* upon it. The precise manner in which this was done, cannot at present be determined, but Maimonides says that in working the inscription, the instruments were applied to the *inside* and *not to the outside* of the plates, so as to make the letters stand out.—¶ HOLINESS TO THE LORD. Heb. קדש ליהוה *kodesh la-Yehovah*, holiness to Jehovah, or the holiness of Jehovah, according to the Gr. which has *ἀγίασμα κυρίου*, the holiness, or sanctification, of the Lord. This was perhaps the most conspicuous object of the High Priest's dress, and was in fact a significant memento of the character of the entire service in which he sustained so prominent a part. By this inscription the wearer became 'as a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid;' the bright memorial incessantly, though silently, proclaiming to the eye, to the heart, to

the conscience, 'a holy God, a holy service, a holy minister, a holy people, and a holy covenant.' The children of Israel could not look upon it without being reminded of the great principle which Jehovah would have to pervade all his worship, and which is elsewhere so solemnly announced, 'I will be sanctified in all them that draw nigh unto me.' And to the saints in all ages it should serve as a remembrancer of the equivalent intimation, that as 'he which hath called us is holy, so are we to be holy in all manner of conversation.'

37. And thou shalt put it on a blue lace. An idiomatic expression for 'put upon it.' It was to hang by a ribbon of blue upon the Mitre, as is intimated in the words following, and as represented in the cut. The Talmudists however say, there were three ribbons, one at each ear, and one in the middle, passing over the head. We have accordingly so represented it on the smaller figure in the cut, as there is no inconsistency in supposing it to have

38 And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may <sup>u</sup>bear

<sup>u</sup> ver. 43. Lev. 10. 17. & 22. 9. Numb. 18. 1. Isai. 53. 11. Ezek. 4. 4, 5, 6. John 1. 29. Hebr. 9. 28. 1 Pet. 2. 24.

been the case.—¶ *That it may be upon the mitre.* Heb. מִצְנֶפֶת *mitzne-pheth*, from צָנַף *tzanaph*, to wrap, to enwrap, to roll round. The term applies itself at once to the style of head-dress common among the Arabs, Turks, Persians, and other Oriental nations, called *the turban*, and formed of a number of swathes or foldings of cloth. As nothing is said of the *precise form* of the High Priest's Mitre, we are doubtless at liberty to suppose it justly represented in the main by an eastern turban, though perhaps of more than usual amplitude. By the ancient Greeks this kind of covering for the head was called *tiara*, and *cidaris*, and sometimes *diadema*; and that it was not unusual to have it made of *fine linen*, as in the present case, is clear from the fact that Justin relates of Alexander the Great,

the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his fore-

that he took the *diadem* from his head to bind up the wounds of Lysimachus. From these titles we perceive new evidence that the priestly Mitre carried at the same time a *kingly* import; and it is even supposed that the inveterate predilection of the Orientals for the turban arises from the belief of some mystic virtue emblematic of *sovereignty* still clinging to it. The Mitre of Aaron merely covered the crown and upper part of the head without descending low upon the forehead, which was left bare for the golden Plate to lie upon it below the edge of the Mitre. In this respect the Mitre of the High Priest differed from the bonnets of the common priests, which having no plate sunk lower on the forehead. In other points the general resemblance was very striking.



THE HIGH PRIEST'S MITRE.

38. *That Aaron may bear the iniquity, &c.* The implication plainly is, that there might be, unconsciously perhaps to the offerers, some defects in the oblations presented, which were graciously *pardoned*—a frequent sense of *borne* or *carried* in the Scriptures—by the intercession of the High Priest ap-

pearing before God perfectly attired and crowned in the manner presented. The efficacy, however, of this inter-mediation on the part of Aaron appears to be in some way more especially concentrated in this resplendent inscribed plate upon his forehead, and this we think can only be understood by refer-

head, that they may be w accepted before the LORD.

39 ¶ And thou shalt embroider

w Lev. 1. 4. & 22. 27. & 23. 11. Isai. 56. 7.

ence to the typical character which the High Priest sustained. Christ, we well know, is represented as 'bearing the sins,' i. e. the *punishment* due to the sins of men. Aaron in his office was a type of Christ, and accordingly is represented not only as *making an atonement* in general for the sins of the people, by the sacrifices offered, but also as making an atonement for the *imperfections of the atonement itself*. This was done, it appears, by what we may term the memorial and typical virtue of the shining plate of the Mitre, upon the inscription of which God is supposed to look and thereby be reminded of that perfect 'holiness to the Lord' which should so preeminently distinguish the great Mediator whom Aaron represented. The following passages must be taken in this connexion in order fully to convey the import of the language, Ps. 84. 9, 'Behold, O God our shield, and *look upon the face of thine anointed.*' Ps. 132. 9, 10, 'Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness;

the coat of fine linen, and thou shalt make the mitre *of* fine linen, and thou shalt make the girdle *of* needle-work.

and let thy saints shout for joy. For thy servant David's sake, *turn not away the face of thine anointed.*' i. e. be propitious by looking upon the face; regard the significance of the golden plate. The prayers embracing this expression appear to have a special allusion to the *imperfections of the holy things* of the people of God.

#### THE COAT OR TUNIC.

39. *Thou shalt embroider the coat of fine linen, &c.* Heb. כֶּתֶנֶת *kethoneth*. This was the innermost of the sacerdotal vestments, being a long robe with sleeves to the wrists, which sat close to the body, and extended down to the feet. This garment was not peculiar to the High Priest, but was similar to that worn by the other priests while officiating. What became of the tunic of the High Priests we do not know; but that of the common priests was unravelled when old, and made into wicks for the lamps burnt in the feast of tabernacles.



THE COAT, OR TUNIC.

40 ¶ And for Aaron's sons thou shalt make coats, and thou shalt make for them girdles, and bonnets shalt thou make for them, for glory and for beauty.

41 And thou shalt put them upon

<sup>x</sup> ver. 4. ch. 39. 27, 28, 29, 41. Ezek. 44. 17. 18.

Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him: and shalt <sup>y</sup>anoint them, and <sup>z</sup>consecrate them, and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office.

<sup>y</sup> ch. 29. 7. & 30. 30. & 40. 15. <sup>z</sup> ch. 29. 9, & c. Lev. ch. 8. Hebr. 7. 28.

#### THE GIRDLE.

¶ *Girdle of needle-work.* Heb. אֲבֵנֶת *abnet*. This was a piece of fine twined linen, embroidered with blue, purple, and scarlet, and which went round the body. Josephus says it was embroidered with flowers; and also states that it was four fingers broad, and that, after being wound twice around the body, it was fastened in front, and the ends allowed to hang down to the feet, on common occasions; but that, when officiating at the altar, the priest threw them over his left shoulder. Maimoni-

des says the Girdle was three fingers broad, and thirty-two cubits long; being, as its length necessarily implies, wound many times round the body. As this Girdle was so narrow, its length, if this statement be correct, will not seem extraordinary to those who are acquainted with the ordinary length of Oriental girdles, and the number of times they are carried around the body. The Girdle was worn over the embroidered coat by the common priests, to whom this coat, unlike the attire of the High Priest, formed the outer garment.



THE GIRDLE.

#### THE BONNETS.

40. *Bonnets.* Heb. מִגְבָּעוֹת *mig-baath*. Gr. κίθαρις, *tiaras*. Vulg. 'Tiaras.' As a different term is used to designate the article here mentioned from that which is applied to the Mitre of the High Priest, there was probably some difference in the form; but what

it was precisely it is difficult to say. According to the Jewish writers the Bonnets came down lower upon the forehead than the Mitre, and rose up higher like an hillock, as the original is derived from גִּבְעָה *geba*, a *hillock*, a *knoll*. In other words they were of a more *conical* shape than the Mitre.

42 And thou shalt make them <sup>a</sup>linen breeches to cover their nakedness: from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach:

43 And they shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the con-

<sup>a</sup> ch. 39. 28. Lev. 6. 10. & 16. 4. Ezek. 44. 18.


This, however, does not convey a very distinct idea, and we must refer the reader to the accompanying cut for a view, which is at best conjectural, of the probable difference between them.

—¶ *For glory and for beauty.* Nothing is more obvious than that the priestly attire was to be so ordered as to present an air of impressive splendor and gorgeousness, that a becoming reverence might be inspired towards the persons of those who wore them. But to us, they present merely a gaudy spectacle, a showy pageant, except so far as we fix our eye upon their *typ-*

gregation, or when they come near <sup>b</sup>unto the altar to minister in the holy *place*; that they <sup>c</sup>bear not iniquity and die. <sup>d</sup>*It shall be* a statute for ever unto him, and his seed after him.

<sup>b</sup> ch. 20. 26. <sup>c</sup> Lev. 5. 1. 17. & 20. 19, 20. & 22. 9. Numb. 9. 13. & 18. 22. <sup>d</sup> ch. 27. 21. Lev. 17. 7.

*ical* import. Here, and here only, in the *glory of grace* and the *beauty of holiness*, which they shadowed forth, do we behold the true *glory* and *beauty* of these sacred robes. It is only as the light of the *substance* is reflected upon the *symbol*, that the symbol itself can at all *shine* in our eyes. But when we discern in these beauteous robes an image of the spiritual attire of the saints, the true royal hierarchy, who are made at once kings and priests unto God, we feel no restraint in letting our admiration go forth towards the external adornments.



THE BONNETS.

#### THE LINEN DRAWERS.

42. *Thou shalt make them linen breeches.* Heb. מִכְנֵסִי *miknesē* bad; more properly *linen drawers*, which though last mentioned were the first put on. 'The ancient Jews, like the modern Arabs and some other Orientals, did not generally wear drawers

or trowsers. Maimonides says that the drawers worn by the priests reached from above the navel to the knee, and had no opening before or behind, but were drawn up around the body by strings, like a purse. This resembles the linen drawers worn by the Turks and Persians at the present day, ex-

cept that they reach rather below the knee. They are very wide altogether, and when drawn on are fastened very tight around the body by means of a string or girdle, which runs through a hem in the upper border.' *Pict. Bible.*



THE DRAWERS.

In concluding this account of the priestly robes, it may be useful to repeat that the robes common to all were—the Drawers, the Embroidered Coat, the Girdle, and the Turban; but, besides this, the High Priest wore the Ephod, the Robe of the Ephod with its Bells and Pomegranates, the Breast-plate over the Ephod, the Shoulder-pieces of onyx-stone, and the engraved ornament of pure gold in front of his turban. The Rabbins seem to have the sanction of the Scripture for their opinion, that the robes were so essential a part of the priestly character, that without them a priest had no more right than private persons, or even foreigners, to officiate at the altar. It seems that the old robes of the priests, as already mentioned in the Note on v. 39, were unravelled, to be burnt as wicks for the lamps at the feast of tabernacles. What was done with those of the High Priest is not known; but analogy would seem to render it probable that they were similarly used for the lamps in the tabernacle. We may remark also that as no shoes or sandals are mentioned

among the sacred vestments, it is supposed the priests always ministered barefoot. This is perhaps confirmed by the fact that Moses, before the symbol of Jehovah at the burning bush, was commanded to put off his shoes.

43. *That they bear not iniquity and die.* That is, that they do not expose themselves to be cut off by a sudden stroke of vengeance for the profanity of appearing before God without their holy garments. Gr. *και ουκ επαζονται προς εαυτους αμαρτιαν, ινα μη αποθωνωσι, and they shall not bring sin upon themselves that they die not.* This caution, as the Hebrew writers have gathered, was intended to apply not to the linen drawers only, but to all the garments. Their language is as follows: ‘The High Priest that ministereth with less than these eight garments, or the inferior Priest that ministereth with less than these four garments, his service is unlawful, and he is guilty of death by the hand of God, even as a stranger that ministereth. When their garments are upon them, their priesthood is upon them; if their garments be not upon

## CHAPTER XXIX.

AND this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them to hallow them, to minister unto me in the

them, their priesthood is not upon them, but, lo, they are as strangers; and it is written, Num. 1. 51, 'The stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.' *Maimonides in Ainsworth.*

## CHAPTER XXIX.

## THE CONSECRATION OF THE PRIESTS.

As God had said, v. 41, of the preceding chapter respecting Aaron and his sons, 'Thou shalt anoint them and consecrate them and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office,' he proceeds in the present chapter to prescribe, with great minuteness, the manner in which this solemn ceremony should be performed. As the office which they were to sustain was in itself one of the utmost importance to themselves and the people, it was proper that the mode of their induction into it should be in the highest degree august and impressive; and as nothing of the kind had been done before, and as a permanent form of inauguration was now to be fixed upon, we see abundant reason for the express appointment of the various ceremonies by which the procedure was to be marked. These were of such a nature as was calculated to affect the incumbents with the greatness and sacredness of the work to which they were called, and also to lead the people to magnify and reverence an office in which their interests were so deeply involved. The whole transaction was to be so conducted that there should be ample evidence that Aaron and his sons did not 'glorify themselves to be made priests,' but that they were 'called of God' to exercise the sacerdotal functions. The Most High did, as it were, in this ceremony put his hand upon them, distinguish

priest's office: <sup>a</sup> Take one young bullock, and two rams without blemish,

<sup>a</sup> Lev. 8. 2.

them from common men, set them apart from common services, and make them the fixed organ of communication between himself and the chosen race. 'The consecration of God was upon their heads.' But while they were thus made to feel that they were invested with an office of the highest sanctity, and one in which they were to expiate the sins of the people by typical sacrifices, they were not suffered to forget that they also were themselves sinners, and needed an expiation as much as any of those for whom they ministered. Accordingly the very first step in the ceremony of consecration was the providing of a bullock, rams, &c., as a sin-offering for themselves, to keep them perpetually reminded of the fact that the 'law made men priests that had infirmity, who needed first to offer up sacrifices for their own sins, and then for the people's,' Heb. 7. 27, 28. The typical reference of the office itself to the Savior Jesus Christ, the Messiah or Anointed One, the great High Priest of the Church, is very obvious, although those parts of the consecrating ceremony which implied sinful infirmity in its subjects could have no bearing in relation to him who was in himself 'holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.' He needed not to be sanctified by the blood of rams and bullocks, or made perfect by the death of others, inasmuch as he has by his one offering of himself upon the cross satisfied for ever all the demands of the law upon himself and his believing people.

1. *And this is the thing that thou shalt do.* Heb. *הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה* *haddabar, the word.* Gr. *καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν, and these are the things.* See Note on Gen. 15. 1. — *To hallow them.* Heb. *לְקַדֵּשׁ*

2 And <sup>b</sup> unleavened bread, and cakes unleavened tempered with

<sup>b</sup> Lev. 2. 4. & 6. 20, 21, 22.

אתם *lekaddësh otham*, to sanctify them, to set them apart. This is here a term denoting that general consecration to the priestly office which is expanded in fuller detail in the sequel of the chapter. The subsequent expression 'consecrate,' v. 9, 29, has respect rather to one particular part of the ceremonies enjoined on the occasion.—¶ To minister in the priest's office. This is expressed in Hebrew by the single term לכהן *lekahën*, from כהן *kohën*, a priest, and signifying literally to act the priest, to discharge the priestly functions. See Note on Ex. 28. 1.

—¶ Take one young bullock. Heb. פרה אחד בן בקר *par ehad ben bakar*, one bullock a son (i. e. a youngling) of the herd. The Heb. פרה *par*, from which comes the German 'Farre,' a young bull, a bullock, is a generic term equivalent to the Lat. 'pullus,' a foal, denoting the young of cattle, and yet not at the youngest age. It is perhaps most properly rendered, as here, by *bullock*, as is the fem. פרה *parah* by *heifer*. Gr. μοσχάριον εκ βοων, a youngling or calf of the oxen. Some of the Hebrew doctors suppose that בן בקר *ben bakar* implies a bullock of not less than three years old; but this cannot be made to appear, though it doubtless denotes one that has been sometime weaned.—

¶ Without blemish. Heb. תמימים *temimim*, perfect; i. e. without defect, superfluity, or deformity. The animal and the other articles mentioned in this connexion were to be the first which were to be provided, but they were not to be used till various other preliminary ceremonies, such as washing, robing, &c., had been performed. In fact the consecration itself here ordered did not take place till after the tabernacle was erected. See Lev. 8. 9, 10.

2. Unleavened bread, and cakes, &c.

oil, and wafers unleavened annointed with oil: of wheaten flour shalt thou make them.

It is important to bear in mind, in reference to the Jewish ritual generally, that the ideas of *sacrificing* and of *feasting* are very intimately related to each other. We are doubtless much in the habit of regarding the offerings of the Mosaic law as pertaining wholly to one party, and as a purely expiatory act on the part of the offerer, in which nothing of a *mutual* nature was implied. But the truth is, these sacrifices actually partook more or less of the character of a *mutual entertainment*, for with the exception of the *holocaust*, or *whole-burnt-offering*, and of certain parts which were offered and consumed upon the altar, the rest were eaten by the offerers and the priests, and this fact will account for some of the oblations consisting of articles which were and always have been articles of diet. The Most High could not be expected of course to make a party at a *literal table*, but at the same time such viands as would be set upon a table might be offered to him. and the fire of his altar as his representative might consume them. Considering therefore the character and relation of the parties, the disposal of the sacrificial offerings came as near perhaps to the semblance of a *mutual feast* as the nature of the case would allow. If this view of the subject be admitted, it will account for the requirement of such offerings on the present occasion as unleavened cakes and wafers mingled with oil. In our ordinary meals *flesh* and *bread* go together; and so in the present case, although the ram was to be a holocaust, yet the bullock was to be part offered and part eaten, constituting with its annexed meat or meal-offering, the matter of an entertainment in which God and they might feast together in token of friendship and fellowship. In this there was



3 And thou shalt put them into one basket, and bring them in the basket, with the bullock and the two rams.

4 And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water.

<sup>c</sup> ch. 40. 12. Lev. 8. 6. Hebr. 10. 22.

a distinct allusion to the prevalent custom in the East of ratifying every important covenant transaction by an entertainment of which the covenanting parties partook together. In like manner, the Lord's supper is often properly represented as a *feast upon a sacrifice*. While it commemorated the sacrifice made by the death of the divine victim it betokened at the same time the *pacification* and covenant fellowship of Christ and his followers. The vegetable offering here prescribed as an accompaniment to the animal sacrifice constituted a *מִנְחָה* *minhah* or *mincha*, as it is usually termed, of the nature of which see Note on Gen. 4. 3. The two first, the bread and the cakes, were mixed with oil (i. e. oil of olives) before baking; the last, the wafers, were merely smeared with oil after they were baked. The original term for 'wafers' *רִקִּיקִים* *rekikim* comes from *רָקַק* *ra-kak*, to be or to be made thin, and is applied to signify a *thin kind of cakes* similar to what are known among us by the name of 'pan-cakes.' The Ital. version has 'fritella' *fritters*. These were all to be put into a basket as constituting one *מִנְחָה* *minhah* or *bread-offering*, and brought along with the bullock and the rams to the door of the tabernacle, and there presented to the Lord.

4. *Shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle.* To the open space in the court in front of the tabernacle, and near the entrance. It was here that the altar and the laver stood, and where all the ordinary sacrificial services were

5 <sup>d</sup> And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod, and the breastplate, and gird him with <sup>e</sup> the curious girdle of the ephod:

6 <sup>f</sup> And thou shalt put the mitre

<sup>d</sup> ch. 28. 2. Lev. 8. 7. <sup>e</sup> ch. 28. 8. <sup>f</sup> Lev. 8. 9.

performed. Moreover, as God was pleased to dwell by his Shekinah in the tabernacle, and the people attended in the court, it was peculiarly appropriate that those who were to act as mediators between these two parties should be consecrated in some intervening spot between them; and such a spot was here appointed where the sacerdotal daysman might, as it were, 'lay his hand upon both.'—¶ *Shalt wash them with water.* That is, with the water of the laver, which was made, anointed, and set in the court of the tabernacle before the priests were consecrated. It is reasonably supposed, though not expressly asserted, that on this occasion their whole bodies were washed, whereas at other times when engaged in their ministrations they only washed their hands and feet; and to this our Savior perhaps alludes, John, 13. 10, 'He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.' The object of this preliminary oblation cannot well be mistaken. It was emblematical of that inward spiritual cleansing which so obviously becomes those who minister in holy things. 'Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord,' is the fixed decree of heaven.

5. *Thou shalt take the garments, &c.* The entire person having duly undergone the prescribed ablution, the next step was the putting on the priestly garments so particularly described in the preceding chapter. By this was implied that not only were they to put away the impurities of the flesh, but to

upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre.

7 Then shalt thou take the an-

ointing oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him.

Ex. ch. 28. 41. & 30. 35. Lev. 8. 12. & 10, 7, & 21. 10. Num. 35. 25.

clothe themselves also with the graces of the Spirit, significantly shadowed forth by the splendid robes in which they were to officiate. The original word for 'gird' is אָפַד *aphad*, to bind, girdle, enclose, from which 'Ephod' is a derivative. The act of girding seems to denote readiness and preparation for active service. So the ministers of Christ, prompt to do his will, are symbolically represented, Rev. 15. 6, by 'angels coming out of the temple clothed in pure and white linen, and having their breasts girded with golden girdles.'

—π *The holy crown.* That is, the plate of gold with the blue lace above mentioned, Ex. 28. 36, 37. It is here called נֶזֶר *nezer*, separation, from its being a badge of the wearer being separated from his brethren. It is elsewhere used as a denomination of the diadems of kings, 2 Sam. 1. 19. Ps. 89. 40. The mention of the linen drawers is here omitted, because they were put on privately before they came to the more public vestry at the door of the tabernacle.

7. *Thou shalt then take the anointing oil, &c.* Heb. שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה *she-men hammishshah*, oil of unction; the peculiar mode of compounding which for sacred purposes is afterwards detailed, Ex. 30. 23—33. This was perhaps the most important, because the most significant, part of the ceremony of the consecration. As the High Priest was a type of Christ, whatever part of the ceremonies represented the most eminent endowments and attributes of the great Antitype were certainly of paramount import to all others. Now the ineffable sanctity of the Savior, the measureless possession of the gifts and graces the Holy Spirit conferred upon him, was one of those divine quali-

cations which went preeminently to constitute the greatness, the fitness, and glory of his sacerdotal character; and so far as the communication of this plenary gift of the Spirit could be shadowed forth by any physical act, it was done by the process of anointing. Thus, Is. 61. 1, 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach,' &c. Indeed it is from the import of this act that our Lord receives his most familiar designation. The Heb. term for *anoint* is מָשַׁח *mashah*, from which comes מָשִׁיחַ *mashiah* or *Messiah*. Greek Χριστός, *Christ*, i. e. the Anointed One, the pre-eminent and distinguishing appellation of the Savior of men. The consecration of the High Priest to his office was a type of that of Christ, and of this the pouring out of the holy oil was a most beautiful emblem. As oil insinuates itself into and diffuses itself over the body to which it is applied, so the divine nature, the informing Spirit of God, possessed wholly the human person of Jesus, communicating to him all those attributes and perfections which exalted the 'name of Jesus above every name,' and qualified him to act as Mediator between God and man. In the consecration of the Aaronic order, the inferior priests were only sprinkled with this oil mixed with the blood of the sacrifice, but in the unction of the High Priest the oil was so copiously poured forth as to 'run down upon the beard, and even to the skirts of his garments.' It was like 'the dew of Hermon,' says the Psalmist, 'descending upon the mountains of Zion.' This was because it pointed to him who received the Spirit 'without measure.' He was 'anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows;' i. e. above those who pos-

8 And <sup>h</sup> thou shalt bring his sons, and put coats upon them.

9 And thou shalt gird them with girdles (Aaron and his sons) and

<sup>h</sup> Lev. 8. 13.

put the bonnets on them; and <sup>i</sup> the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute: and thou shalt <sup>k</sup> consecrate Aaron and his sons.

<sup>i</sup> Num. 18. 7. <sup>k</sup> ch. 28. 41. Lev. 8. 22. &c. Hebr. 7. 28.

sessed with him a *fellowship* or similarity of office, as types of himself. Aaron was anointed high priest; Saul was anointed king; Elisha was anointed prophet; Melchizedek, king and priest; Moses, priest and prophet; David, king and prophet; yet none was ever anointed to the joint possession of all these dignities together save the *Christ* of God, the antitype of them all. *Christians* derive the name of *Christians* from their profession of *Christ*, and the nature and character of *Christians* from their union to *Christ*. It is their peculiar privilege and distinguishing joy, 'to have the *unction* from the Holy One, and to know all things,' that are necessary for them to know. As the oil which was poured upon Aaron was so copiously effused as to run down to the 'skirts of his clothing,' so the unction of the Holy One was so abundant, that from him as the Head, it ever has and ever will run down to the meanest and weakest believers. And this 'anointing which they receive of him, abideth in them, and teacheth them.' What distinguished honor then, what strong consolation, pertain to them, who are made one with Christ, and who feel the heavenly influences of his Spirit in their souls! They obtain a life from him with which they were not born; and which because it is *his* life can never be destroyed!

8. And thou shalt bring. Heb. תִּקְרִיב *takrib*, shalt bring near, shalt cause to approach. But whether the term is to be understood in a general sense of their being *set apart* or *devoted* to the service of God, or more strictly of their being *brought near* to the door of the Tabernacle, where these consecration-cere-

monies were to be performed, is not certain. They were to be immediately robed in their sacred garments, as the *anointing rite* was to be confined to Aaron as High Priest. These garments were the drawers or breeches, the coat, the girdle, and the bonnet. The first two were like those of the High Priest. The bonnet was probably the same as the mitre worn by the high priest with the slight difference before mentioned. The girdles of the inferior priests were of the same form as that of the high priest; but less costly and of less elegant texture. These four garments were of linen, such as were worn by the Egyptian priests as emblems of innocence. Cicero has observed from Plato, that 'white is a color peculiarly becoming the Deity.'

9. Put bonnets on them. Heb. חִבַּשְׁתָּ לָהֶם *habashta lahem*, shalt bind to them; a phraseology adapted to the act of wrapping a head-dress upon one, whereas our term 'put' is more obviously conformed to the usages with which we are familiar in loosely and lightly covering the head with a cap, hat, or bonnet.—¶ For a perpetual statute. Heb. לְחֻקַּת עוֹלָם *lehukkath olam*, for a statute of eternity; i. e. they shall enjoy that office in uninterrupted succession as long as the Aaronical Priesthood itself continued.—¶ Thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons. This, as we have before remarked, is not the term for the *general act* of consecration here described, but for a *particular ceremony* forming a part of it. The original is מִלְּאָת יָדְךָ *millētha yad*, thou shalt fill the hand of Aaron and his sons; an expression alluding to the fact of some part of the sacrifice being put

10 And thou shalt cause a bullock to be brought before the tabernacle of the congregation; and <sup>1</sup> Aaron

<sup>1</sup> Lev. 1. 4. & 8. 14.

into their hands to be waved and then borne to the altar. As sacrificing was a very prominent part of the sacerdotal office, this was a ceremony strikingly significant of the nature of the functions which they were called to discharge; and as it was the first or initiating action that marked their entrance upon the performance of the priestly services, the idea of *consummation* or *perfection* is attached to it, for which reason it is rendered in English by the term *consecrate*, as if it were the crowning ceremony of the whole. So also the Gr. τελειωσεις Ααρων τας χειρας αυτου, και τας χειρας των υιων αυτου, *thou shalt consummate, or perfect, the hands of Aaron and the hands of his sons*; i. e. thou shalt do to him, through the medium of his hands, that which shall be virtually the *perfecting* act of investiture upon his person. Arab. 'Thou shalt complete, or perfect, the glory of Aaron and the glory of his sons.' Accordingly in allusion to this the apostle, Heb. 7. 28, says, 'The law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the son who is *consecrated* (τετελειωμενον *perfected*) for evermore. The allusion is probably the same in other cases where the term 'perfect' is applied to Christ, implying an *official* instead of *personal* perfection, or in other words that *fulness of endowment*, and that *completeness of initiation*, which so signally marked the preeminence of his mediatorial character. The usage which elsewhere obtains in regard to the Hebrew phrase may serve to give a still clearer view of its import in this connexion, 1 Chron. 29. 3, 5, 'I have prepared for the holy house—the gold for things of gold, and the silver

and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the bullock.

11 And thou shalt kill the bullock before the LORD, *by* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

for things of silver, and for all manner of work to be made by the hands of artificers. And who then is willing to *consecrate his service* (למלאת ידו *lemalloth yado, to fill his hands*) this day unto the Lord.' This is obviously an exhortation to a liberal giving to a sacred purpose; and whoever proposes to make a donation takes his gift in his hand, and the larger it is, the more is his hand filled with it. Again, Ex. 32. 28, 29, 'And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses; and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men. For Moses had said, *Consecrate yourselves* (מלאו ידכם *milu yedkem, fill your hands*) to day to the Lord, even every man upon his son and upon his brother.' This was a kind of *initiating* or *inaugurating* act on the part of the tribe of Levi—a specimen of such thorough-going obedience to the divine mandate as to amount to an installing of themselves in the official dignity to which they were destined. It is easy to perceive from all this the true force of the expression. 'The filling of the hands,' says Rab. Solomon, 'is nothing else than an *initiation* when one enters upon any business that he may be confirmed in it from that day forward.' In a somewhat like manner it is said to have been formerly customary in the English church, when a minister was ordained, for the Bishop to put into his hand a Bible indicative of the nature of the work upon which he had now entered, and of which his *hands*, as well as his *head* and his *heart*, were to be *full*.

*The Bullock for a Sin-offering.*

10. And thou shalt cause a bullock to be brought, &c. The due completion

12 And thou <sup>m</sup> shalt take of the blood of the bullock, and put it

<sup>m</sup> Lev. 8. 15.

of the various ceremonies above described was followed by the oblation of their sacrifices for Aaron and his sons; (1.) A sin-offering; (2.) A burnt-offering; (3.) A peace-offering. The sin-offering, which here consisted of a bullock, was a kind of expiation by which they were first of all to be purified. By the ceremony of putting their hands upon the head of the victim was signified, (1.) that the offerer had need of a sacrifice to atone for his sins; (2.) that he symbolically transferred his sins to the victim; (3.) that he confided in faith and hope that although he deserved himself to die, yet the death of the animal, which he thus devoted to God, would be accepted as an expiation for his sins, so as to avert from him the punishment which they had righteously incurred. The same ceremony of imposition of hands was enjoined upon every one who brought a sacrifice for his sins, Lev. 4. 24, 29, and the manner of it, as practised by the Jews, is thus particularly described by Maimonides in his Treatise on the Sacrificial Offerings; 'There is no imposing of hands but in the court. If he lay on hands without, he must lay them on again within. None may impose hands but a clean person. In the place where hands are imposed, there they kill the beast immediately after the imposition. He that imposeth must do it with all his might, with both his hands upon the beast's head, not upon the neck or sides; and there may be nothing between his hands and the beast. If the sacrifice be of the most holy things, it standeth on the north side (as Lev. 1. 11.), with the face to the west; the imposer standeth eastward with his face to the west, and layeth his two hands between the two horns, and con-

upon <sup>n</sup> the horns of the altar with thy finger, and pour all the blood beside the bottom of the altar.

<sup>n</sup> ch. 27. 2. & 30. 2.

fesseth sin over the sin-offering and trespass over the trespass-offering, &c., and saith, 'I have sinned; I have committed iniquity; I have trespassed, and done thus and thus, and do return by repentance before thee, and with this I make atonement,' And what could more strikingly represent the fact that, in the economy of redemption, the sins of men are imputed to Christ, 'upon whom the Lord hath laid the iniquity of us all,' Is. 53. 6—8. With this solemn rite before us, how evangelic and happy the familiar strain of the Christian psalmist;

My faith would lay her hand  
On that dear head of thine,  
While like a penitent I stand,  
And there confess my sin.

My soul looks back to see  
The burden thou didst bear,  
When hanging on the cursed tree,  
And hopes her guilt was there.

11. *And thou shalt kill the bullock before the Lord.* That is before the Shekinah. 'Thou shalt kill' is doubtless equivalent to 'thou shalt cause to have killed.' It is not necessary to suppose that Moses, who was not strictly a priest, killed the bullock in person.

12. *Put it on the horns of the altar.* The first sin-offering differed from those ordinarily presented by the priests, in which the blood was carried into the Tabernacle, and applied to the horns of the golden altar of incense, Lev. 4. 3, 7, whereas in the present instance the blood was put upon the horns of the brazen altar of burnt-offering which stood in the court. But the design of this first oblation was to make atonement for the altar itself, and to sanctify it, that it might afterward be fit to sanctify the

13 And ° thou shalt take all the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul *that is* above the liver, and

° Lev. 3. 3.

offerings of the people laid upon it, as is intimated v. 36, 37, and still more plainly taught, Ezek. 43. 25, 26. Besides this, the ceremony did not in this respect differ at this time from that observed by common persons, inasmuch as Aaron and his sons did not become full priests till the period of their seven days' consecration was ended.—¶ *And pour all the blood.* That is, all the rest of the blood.—¶ *Beside the bottom of the altar.* Where there was a trench into which the blood of the sacrifices was poured.

13. *The fat that covereth the inwards.* By the fat that covereth the inwards is meant the thin fatty membrane extended over the intestines, called in Lev. 9. 19, simply 'that which covereth,' and technically denominated the *omentum*—supposed to have been so called from the fact that the heathen diviners derived the good or bad *omens* from the observation of this part of the animal. Although in many instances the 'fat' is said to denote the *best* or *choicest part* of any thing, as is observed upon Gen. 4. 4, yet in other cases it is evidently used as equivalent to that which is *evil*, from the fact that fatness is naturally understood to imply an obtuseness of sensibility. Thus it is said of the wicked, Ps. 119. 70, 'Their heart is as *fat* as grease.' So Deut. 32. 15, 'But Jeshurun *waxed fat* and kicked; thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with *fatness*; then he forsook God which made him.' Again, Is. 6. 10, 'Make the heart of this people *fat*, &c., lest they understand,' &c. The 'fat' therefore, as a signal of man's corruption, God ordered to be consumed with fire on the altar, teaching perhaps the necessity of the mortification of our earthly members

the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, and burn *them* upon the altar.

by the work of the Spirit of Christ.—¶ *The caul that is above the liver.* Heb. יִתְּרֶת עַל הַכֶּבֶד *yothereth al hakkabēd* the *redundance of the liver*. Gr. τοῦ λοβὸν τοῦ ἥπατος, *the lobe of the liver*, i. e. the greater lobe of the liver, which, although a part of the liver itself, may very properly be rendered 'the lobe *over* or *by* the liver.' As the gall-bladder is attached to this part of the liver it is probably to be included in the precept of consumption. Parkhurst remarks; 'If the great excellence of this *billious juice*, and its importance to the well-being of the animal, together with its influence and instrumentality in the passions, both concupiscible and irascible, are duly considered, we shall see the reasons why the *gall-bladder* was especially ordered by God to be taken off and consumed on the altar.' Of the moral design of this part of the Jewish ritual the early Jewish commentators say; 'Therefore the kidneys and the fat which is on them, and the caul that covereth the liver, were burnt unto God to make atonement for the sins of men, which proceedeth out of the thoughts of the reins, and the lust of the liver, and the fatness of the heart, for they all consent in sin.'—¶ *And burn them upon the altar.* Heb. הִקְטַרְתָּ *hiktarta*, *burn*. The original here is not the word usually employed to signify *consuming by fire*. The Heb. קָטַר *katar*, in its native import, implies *the making a fume by incense*, and when applied to sacrifices denotes the rising up of their smoke as the vapor of incense, from their peculiar acceptableness to him to whom they were offered. From the same root comes מִקְטֹרֶת *miktoreth*, *a censer, an instrument for fuming incense*; and in the participle נִקְטָר *niktar*, *perfumed*, we trace the origin of

14 But *p* the flesh of the bullock, and his skin, and his dung shalt thou burn with fire without the camp: it is a sin-offering.

*p* Lev. 4. 11, 12, 21. Heb. 13. 11.

the classic *Nectar*, the fabled beverage of the gods, from their inhaling the perfumed odor of incense as if it were a delightful drink. It was probably to convey a somewhat similar idea that the word is employed in the present connexion, viz., that these bloody sacrifices, rightly and reverently presented, were as *acceptable* as if they had been an offering of incense.

14. *But the flesh, &c., shalt thou burn with fire without the camp.* Here the word for 'burning' is intirely different from that in the former verse, implying a consumption by a *strong fire* and excluding the idea of that grateful incense-like odor which was conveyed by the sacrifice of the fat. It appears to have been ordained with a view to inspire a greater detestation of sin in those sustaining the priestly office. The language of the action was, 'Let all iniquity be *far* from them that bear the vessels of the Lord.' In the case of a sin-offering for the prince or any other person, this usage of burning without the camp was not observed, but as the iniquities of the priests were of a more heinous character, a corresponding brand of reprobation was stamped upon them by this enactment. It was doubtless with a view to indicate that Christ was made a sacrifice under circumstances of the greatest possible ignominy that the apostle, Heb. 13. 12, 13, alludes to this precept of the law; 'Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered *without the gate*. Let us go forth, therefore, unto him *without the camp*, bearing his reproach.'—¶ *It is a sin-offering.* Heb. חַטָּאת הַזֶּה *hat-tath hu, it is a sin*. This strong language implied that it must be treated

15 ¶ *q* Thou shalt also take one ram; and Aaron and his sons shall *r* put their hands upon the head of the ram.

*q* Lev. 8. 18. *r* Lev. 1. 4,—9.

with abhorrence and consumed by the fire, as if it were *sin* itself. Judging from the usage of the Greek it would seem that the phrase is accurately enough translated, but the expression throws a decided light upon the emphatic language of the apostle, 2 Cor. 5. 21, 'Christ was made *sin* for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.'

#### *The Ram for a Burnt-offering.*

15. *Thou shalt also take one ram.* That is, one of the two commanded to be taken, v. 1. The remark of Rabbi Levi ben Gerson respecting the design of these several victims may here be appropriately given. 'It is proper to notice the order in which these sacrifices were offered. For first of all an atonement for sins was made by the *sin-offering*; of which nothing but the fat was offered to God (to whom be praise); because the offerers were not yet worthy of God's acceptance of a gift and present from them. But after they had been purified, to indicate their being devoted to the sacred office, they immolated to God (to whom be praise) a *holocaust*, which was entirely consumed upon the altar. And after the holocaust they offered a sacrifice resembling a *peace-offering*, of which part used to be given to God, part to the priests, and part to the offerers, and which was to indicate their being now received into favor with God, so as to use one common table with him.' *Outram*. To this we may add, that the ram was *wholly* burnt to the honor of God, in token of the dedication of themselves wholly to God and to his service, as *living sacrifices*, kindled with the fire and ascending in the flame of holy

16 And thou shalt slay the ram, and thou shalt take his blood, and sprinkle *it* round about upon the altar.

17 And thou shalt cut the ram in pieces, and wash the inwards of him, and his legs, and put *them* unto his pieces, and unto his head.

18 And thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar: it is a burnt-offering unto the LORD: it is a <sup>s</sup> sweet savour, an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

<sup>s</sup> Gen. 8. 21.

love.—¶ *Shall put their hands upon the head, &c.* The general import of this action was always the same, viz., to indicate the sinfulness of the offerers, and to prefigure the vicarious sufferings of Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. It was done on the present occasion, though the ram offered was a *ram of consecration*, to convey the same impressive lesson that it ordinarily did to those concerned. Upon the priests' initiation into their office they were to be taught the full significancy of the various sacrifices which they were henceforth to be employed in offering.

16. *Shalt take his blood, and sprinkle it, &c.* As nothing is said of any other disposition of any part of the blood, we may suppose it was *all* to be sprinkled about the altar; or, as others conjecture, *poured on the altar round about*, to be consumed or 'licked up' by the fire along with the flesh.

18. *It is a sweet savor.* Heb. רִיחַ נִיחֻוּהַ רֵיחַ *rēha nihovah, a savor of rest*; i. e. an *appeasing* odor, from its supposed efficacy in *quieting* and *pacifying* the divine displeasure, and rendering the offerer acceptable. Chal. 'That it may be received with favorable acceptance.' Gr. εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας, *for a savor of sweet smell*; an expression adopted by the apostle, Eph. 5. 2. See Note on Gen. 8. 21.

19 ¶<sup>t</sup> And thou shalt take the other ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram.

20 Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about.

<sup>t</sup> ver. 3. Lev. 8. 22.

### *The Ram for a Peace-offering.*

20. *Take of the blood, and put it upon the tip, &c.* That the ram now to be offered, and called, v. 22, 'the ram of consecration,' was truly a *peace-offering* will be obvious from what is said in v. 28, 32. It is doubtless called *the ram of consecration* because there was more in this sacrifice that was peculiar to the present occasion than in either of the others. The ceremonies, therefore, were more numerous and significant. The blood instead of being merely sprinkled on the horns of the altar, or effused round about it, was shared, as it were, between God and them; part of it being sprinkled, and part put upon them, upon their bodies, and upon their garments. The parts of their persons to which it was applied were no doubt selected with a view to render the rite most replete with instruction relative to the duties of their station. It was intended to imply that they ought to devote diligently their *ears*, their *hands*, and their *feet*, or in other words, all their faculties of mind and body, to the discharge of their ministerial office. By the blood's being applied to the *extreme* parts of the body, they could not but understand that the *whole* person in all its entirety, from the tip of the ear to the toe of the foot, was to be sanctified and set apart to the service of God.



21 And thou shalt take of the blood that *is* upon the altar, and of <sup>u</sup> the anointing oil, and sprinkle *it* upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him: and *w* he shall be hallowed, and

<sup>u</sup> ch. 30. 25, 31. Lev. 8. 30. w ver. 1. Hebr. 9. 22.

21. *Upon the garments.* This was merely to carry out in all its completeness, and in reference to every thing about them, the significant rite of the sprinkled blood. The apostle tells us, Heb. 9. 22, that 'almost all things were by the law purged with blood'; and as the sacred garments were the badge of that office which enabled them to be instrumental in sanctifying and purifying others, it was manifestly proper that they should themselves receive fully the sign of the same cleansing and consecrating influence. 'We reckon,' says Henry, 'that the blood and oil, sprinkled upon garments, spotted and stained them; yet the holy oil and the blood of the sacrifice, sprinkled upon their garments, must be looked upon as the greatest adorning imaginable to them, for they signified the blood of Christ, and the graces of the Spirit, which constitute and complete the beauty of holiness, and recommend us to God. We read of robes 'made *white* with the blood of the Lamb.'

22. *The fat and the rump.* Heb. אֵיל מִלְּאִים *alyah*, defined by Gesenius and Rosenmuller the *thick fatty tail* of the Syrian sheep. Russell in his *Natural History of Aleppo*, p. 51, after observing that they are in that country much more numerous than those with smaller tails, adds, 'This tail is very broad and large, terminating in a small appendix that turns back upon it. It is of a substance between fat and marrow, and is not eaten separately, but mixed with the lean meat in many of their dishes, and also often used instead of butter.

his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him.

22 Also thou shalt take of the ram the fat and the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul *above* the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, and the right shoulder: for it *is* a ram of consecration:

A common sheep of this sort, without the head, feet, skin, and entrails, weighs about twelve or fourteen Aleppo rotoloes (a rotoloe is five pounds), of which the tail is usually three rotoloes or upwards; but such as are of the largest breed, and have been fattened, will sometimes weigh above thirty rotoloes, and the tail of these ten. These very large sheep being about Aleppo kept up in yards, are in no danger of injuring their tails: but in some other places, where they feed in the fields, the shepherds are obliged to fix a piece of thin board to the under part of their tail, to prevent its being torn by bushes and thistles, as it is not covered underneath with thick wool like the upper part. Some have small wheels to facilitate the dragging of this board after them.' This contrivance is at least as old as Herodotus, who expressly mentions it (Lib. III. c. 115.), where, speaking of the Arabian shepherds' management to prevent this kind of sheep from having their tails rubbed and ulcerated, he says, 'They make little *cars*, and fasten one of these under the *tail* of each sheep.' The Abbe Mariti in his *Travels through Cyprus* (vol. I. p. 36.) confirms this account of the extraordinary size of the tails of some species of eastern sheep; 'The mutton is juicy and tender. The tails of some of the sheep, which are remarkably fine, weigh *upwards of fifty pounds*.'—π It is a ram of consecration. Heb. אֵיל מִלְּאִים אֵיל מִלְּאִים *el milluim hu*, it is a ram of fillings. Gr. ἐστὶ γὰρ τελειωσις αὐτῆς, for this a perfection. That is, a consecrat-

23 \*And one loaf of bread, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer out of the basket of the unleavened bread, that *is* before the LORD.

24 And thou shalt put all in the hands of Aaron, and in the hands of his sons; and shalt *y* wave them *for* a wave-offering before the LORD.

25 *z* And thou shalt receive them of their hands, and burn *them* upon the altar for a burnt-offering, for a sweet savour before the LORD: it *is* an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

\* Lev. 8. 26. *y* Lev. 7. 30. *z* Lev. 8. 28.

*ing initiation* by which the incumbents were *perfected* in their official character. The sense of the term is governed by that which we have already assigned to the root in our remarks above, v. 9. Whether it is implied at the same time that *the hands were filled with pieces of the sacrifice*, as an intimation of their duties, cannot be ascertained. However this may be, the explanation given above is sufficient to account for the form of the expression.

23, 24. *And one loaf of bread, &c.* The Note on v. 2, of this chapter will sufficiently explain the reason of the order respecting the articles here mentioned. As to the 'waving' of the whole to and fro, which was ordinarily done by the priests' putting his hand under theirs, and then lifting them first upwards, and then round about in every direction, it was probably intended as a significant mode of dedicating the offering to Him 'whose is the earth and the fulness thereof;' who is the Possessor of heaven, as well as the earth, and claims a universal homage. If, however, we keep up the idea of a *mutual feast* in connexion with the peace-offering, this ceremony of *waving* may perhaps be considered as a virtual act of *offering or presenting* a dish to an hon-

26 And thou shalt take *a* the breast of the ram of Aaron's consecration, and wave it *for* a wave-offering before the LORD: and *b* it shall be thy part.

27 And thou shalt sanctify *c* the breast of the wave-offering, and the shoulder of the heave-offering, which is waved and which is heaved up, of the ram of the consecration, *even of that which is for* Aaron, and of *that which is for* his sons:

28 And it shall be Aaron's and his sons' *d* by a statute for ever,

*a* Lev. 8. 29. *b* Ps. 99. 6. *c* Lev. 7. 31. 34. Numb. 18. 11, 18. Deut. 18. 3. *d* Lev. 10. 15.

ored guest who sits at the table. This God could not do in person, but he would still have that kind of fellowship recognised, and he made the altar his substitute for devouring his part of the sacrifice. The Gr. renders by *αφορίεις*, *thou shalt separate*, and Paul uses this term in speaking of his designation to the ministry, Rom. 1. 1, as if he had been made in that office a kind of *wave-offering* to the Lord.—¶ *Shalt wave them for a wave-offering.* Heb. הִנַּפְתָּ הַנֹּחֶפֶת אֹתָם הִנַּפְתָּ הֵנַּפְתָּ *hēnaphta otham tenuphah*, *thou shalt wave them a waving*. The original root נוּף *nuph* signifies properly to *shake, agitate, move to and fro, or up and down*.

25. *Burn them upon the altar for a burnt-offering.* Although it is undoubted that this was not a whole burnt-offering, but a peace-offering, yet as some of it was burnt on the altar, that part of it is called a *burnt-offering*. Compare Lev. 3. 5, where all that was to be burnt of the peace-offerings is commanded to be 'burnt upon the burnt sacrifice,' in reference to which act it might very properly be called a *burnt-offering*.

26—28. *And thou shalt take the breast, &c.* These three verses are probably to be regarded as a parenthe-

from the children of Israel: for it is an heave-offering: and <sup>e</sup> it shall be an heave-offering from the children of Israel of the sacrifice of their peace-offerings, *even* their heave-offering unto the LORD.

29 ¶ And the holy garments of Aaron <sup>f</sup>shall be his sons' after him, <sup>g</sup>to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them.

<sup>e</sup> Lev. 7. 34. <sup>f</sup> Numb. 20. 26, 28. <sup>g</sup> Numb. 18. 8. & 35. 25.

sis fixing the law for all future time, in relation to the priests' part of the peace-offering, viz., the breast and shoulder. It is true, that on the present occasion these were divided, and the shoulder burnt on the altar with God's part, v. 22, but ever after they were both to go together as the allotted portion of the priests. This, if we may admit the suggestion of Ainsworth, was intended to intimate to them 'how with all their *heart*, and with all their *strength*, they should give themselves unto the service of the Lord in his church.' As to the precise distinction between *wave-offering* (תנופה *tenuphah*) and *heave-offering* (תרומה *terumah*), it is not easy to ascertain it, as we are furnished with no clue in the original, except what we find in the import of the terms; of which we may say in general that the former more properly denotes *horizontal* and the latter *perpendicular* motion. This fact has led Houbigant and some others to imagine that by this twofold movement in the act of oblation we are to recognise a dim and shadowy *figure of the cross*, on which the great Peace-offering between God and man was offered, in the person of the blessed Redeemer. But as this conjecture rests upon no positive *authority*, we build nothing upon it, leaving the reader to deduce his own inferences from the etymology of the words.

29, 30. *And the holy garments of*

30 *And* <sup>h</sup>that son that is priest in his stead shall put them on <sup>i</sup>seven days, when he cometh into the tabernacle of the congregation to minister in the holy place.

31 ¶ And thou shalt take the ram of the consecration, and <sup>k</sup>seethe his flesh in the holy place.

32 And Aaron and his sons shall eat the flesh of the ram, and the

<sup>h</sup> Numb. 20. 28. <sup>i</sup> Lev. 8. 35. & 9. 1, 8. <sup>k</sup> Lev. 8. 31.

*Aaron shall be*, &c. Another general law is here given, viz., that all the successors of Aaron in the high priesthood should be set apart to the office in the same garments, by the same unction, and, as we learn from v. 36, with the same sacrifices, as those which were prescribed on the present occasion. Accordingly it is said, Num. 20. 28, 'And Moses stripped Aaron of his garments, and put them upon Eleazer his son; and Aaron died there in the top of the mount.' For seven successive days was the high priest to be robed in these sacred vestments, and during that time to abide without intermission at the door of the tabernacle 'keeping the charge of the Lord,' Lev. 8. 35. As the number seven is the Scripture number of *perfection*, and is often used to denote the *completion*, *consummation*, or *fulness* of any thing, so the act of consecration was to last seven days that it might signify a *perfect* consecration, and to intimate to the priest that his *whole life* was to be devoted to his ministry. It afforded the opportunity also for one Sabbath to pass over him in his consecration, in reference to which the Jewish writers say, 'Great is the Sabbath day; for the high priest entereth not upon his service, after he is anointed, till the Sabbath pass over him, as it is written, Ex. 29. 30, 'Seven days shall he that is priest,' &c.

31, 32. *Seethe his flesh in the holy place*. That is, *boil his flesh*, in order

<sup>1</sup> bread that *is* in the basket, *by* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

33 And <sup>m</sup> they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate *and* to sanctify them: <sup>n</sup> but a stranger shall not eat *thereof*, because they *are* holy.

34 And if aught of the flesh of the consecrations, or of the bread, remain unto the morning, then <sup>o</sup> thou shalt burn the remainder

<sup>1</sup> Matt. 12. 4. <sup>m</sup> Lev. 10. 14, 15, 17. <sup>n</sup> Lev. 22. 10. <sup>o</sup> Lev. 8. 32.

to render it edible. The phrase 'holy place' is here used in a wider sense than ordinary. The next verse shows that it means the outer court of the sanctuary near the door. This is still more expressly affirmed Lev. 8. 31. This requisition as to the place of eating was peculiar to the present occasion. In ordinary cases the allotted parts of the peace-offering might be taken home and there eaten by the offerers and their families, but this was to be eaten in God's own house, as it were, where his ministers officiated and neither sons nor daughters could share with them in it.

33. *A stranger shall not eat thereof because they are holy.* Heb. כִּי קֹדֶשׁ הֵם *ki kodesh hēm*, because they are holiness; i. e. the bread and meats. Or the pronoun 'they' may refer to Aaron and his sons, who are called *holy* because they were consecrated to the service of God. 'Stranger' here signifies one that is not of the family of Aaron. Holy things for holy men was the motto of the Levitical economy.

36. *For atonement.* Heb. עַל הַכִּפּוּרִים *al hakkippurim*, pl. for expiations, propitiations, reconciliations; meaning for Aaron and his sons, and the altar. The original term implies both the *pacification* of God's wrath on account of sin, and the merciful *covering* of trans-

gression, which enter so essentially into the idea of *atonement*. See Note on Gen. 32. 20.—¶ *Thou shalt cleanse the altar.* Heb. הִטִּיתָה *hittitha*. Leclerc well remarks that this word in Piel when spoken of *persons* signifies to *expiate*, to *atone for*, but when applied to things to *purge*, *cleanse*, *purify*, as here. Gr. καθαρεις, *thou shalt purify*. It is not to be supposed that this period of seven days allotted to the consecration of the altar was *distinct* from the seven days of consecrating the priests, or that the atonements in the one case were different from those in the other. They were in fact one and the same. The atoning virtue of the sacrifices applied itself at the same time both to the persons sanctified and to the altar. The phrase 'when thou hast made atonement for it,' should rather be rendered 'when thou hast made an atonement upon it,' and the meaning is, that during all the time in which they were engaged from day to day in offering the prescribed sacrifices, they were to be careful to keep the altar duly cleansed, to have the ashes removed, and the unction applied to it, so that at the end of the time it should be an altar duly consecrated, like those who had been ministering at it, so that henceforth it should be so preeminently holy as to confer a

with fire: it shall not be eaten, because it *is* holy.

35 And thus shalt thou do unto Aaron, and to his sons, according to all *things* which I have commanded thee: <sup>p</sup> seven days shalt thou consecrate them.

36 And thou shalt <sup>q</sup> offer every day a bullock *for* a sin-offering for atonement; and thou shalt cleanse the altar, when thou hast made an atonement for it, <sup>r</sup> and thou shalt anoint it, to sanctify it.

<sup>p</sup> Exod. 40. 12. Lev. 8. 33, 34, 35. <sup>q</sup> Hebr. 10. 11. <sup>r</sup> ch. 30. 26, 28, 29. & 40. 10.

gression, which enter so essentially into the idea of *atonement*. See Note on Gen. 32. 20.—¶ *Thou shalt cleanse the altar.* Heb. הִטִּיתָה *hittitha*. Leclerc well remarks that this word in Piel when spoken of *persons* signifies to *expiate*, to *atone for*, but when applied to things to *purge*, *cleanse*, *purify*, as here. Gr. καθαρεις, *thou shalt purify*. It is not to be supposed that this period of seven days allotted to the consecration of the altar was *distinct* from the seven days of consecrating the priests, or that the atonements in the one case were different from those in the other. They were in fact one and the same. The atoning virtue of the sacrifices applied itself at the same time both to the persons sanctified and to the altar. The phrase 'when thou hast made atonement for it,' should rather be rendered 'when thou hast made an atonement upon it,' and the meaning is, that during all the time in which they were engaged from day to day in offering the prescribed sacrifices, they were to be careful to keep the altar duly cleansed, to have the ashes removed, and the unction applied to it, so that at the end of the time it should be an altar duly consecrated, like those who had been ministering at it, so that henceforth it should be so preeminently holy as to confer a

37 Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and sanctify it; <sup>s</sup> and it shall be an altar most holy: <sup>t</sup> whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy.

38 ¶ Now this *is that* which thou shalt offer upon the altar; <sup>u</sup> two lambs of the first year <sup>w</sup> day by day continually.

39 The one lamb thou shalt offer <sup>x</sup> in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even:

<sup>s</sup> ch. 40. 10. <sup>t</sup> ch. 30. 29. Matt. 23. 19. <sup>u</sup> Numb. 28. 3. 1 Chron. 16. 40. 2 Chron. 2. 4. & 13. 11. & 31. 3. Ezra 3. 3. <sup>w</sup> See Dan. 9. 27. & 12. 11. <sup>x</sup> 2 Kings 16. 15. Ezek. 46. 13, 14, 15.

relative holiness upon the gifts laid upon it. 'Whatsoever toucheth it shall be holy,' upon which our Savior's brief and pithy comment is, 'The altar sanctifieth the gift.' Like a magnetized bar of iron or steel, it was first to receive itself a sanctifying influence from the oblations presented upon it, and then for ever after to impart it.

#### *Law of the Daily Offering.*

38—44. *This is that which thou shalt offer, &c.* Two lambs of the first year were to be offered daily, the one in the morning, the other in the afternoon, for a burnt-offering. These were generally termed the *morning* and *evening daily sacrifice*, and were never on any account to be intermitted. Other additional sacrifices were appointed for Sabbaths and festivals on various occasions, but they were never to be allowed to displace, supersede, or interfere with this stated and constant offering, which was binding in its observance inasmuch as it typified the never-ceasing necessity and efficacy of the atonement made by the 'Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.' It conveyed also to the people of God of that age and of every age a significant intimation of the duty of daily morning and evening worship. As regularly as the sun rises and declines in his daily

40 And with the one lamb a tenth-deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil: and the fourth part of an hin of wine *for* a drink-offering.

41 And the other lamb thou shalt <sup>y</sup> offer at even, and shalt do thereto according to the meat-offering of the morning, and according to the drink-offering thereof, for a sweet savour, an offering made by fire unto the Lord.

42 *This shall be* <sup>z</sup> a continual burnt-offering <sup>y</sup> 1 Kings 18. 29, 36. <sup>2</sup> Kings 16. 15. Ezra 9. 4, 5. Ps. 141. 2. Dan. 9. 21. <sup>z</sup> ver. 38. ch. 30. 8. Numb. 28. 6. Dan. 8. 11, 12, 13.

round, the spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise are to be offered upon the altar of our domestic or private devotion; and not only should no business be suffered to jostle them out of their appropriate seasons, but they should be regarded as a sacred feast to the soul, for which we should long as earnestly as for the food that sustains our bodies. It was probably with a view to render this idea more familiar to their minds that the several particulars requisite to a feast accompanied the sacrifice. Bread and wine for a meat and drink-offering formed a part of the commanded oblation, as a continual remembrance of the privilege of fellowship and communion with God to which they are admitted. The word rendered *tenth-deal* (עֲשָׂרֹן *issaron*) means a *tenth of an ephah*, or about three quarts wine-measure, being the same as an omer. A *hin* contained a gallon and two pints; the fourth part of this was consequently about one quart and a quarter of a pint wine-measure.—π *Where I will meet you* (pl.) *to speak there unto thee* (sing.) As if he spake unto all the congregation when he spake to Moses, their representative. Yet as if this might appear to indicate something unduly *exclusive*—a privilege vouchsafed to Moses but denied to them—he gives the assurance in the next verse in the *most uni*

offering throughout your generations *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD: <sup>a</sup> where I will meet you to speak there unto thee.

43 And there I will meet with the children of Israel; and *the tabernacle* <sup>b</sup> shall be sanctified by my glory.

<sup>a</sup> ch. 25. 22. & 30. 6, 36. Numb. 17. 4. <sup>b</sup> ch. 40. 34. 1 Kings 8. 11. 2 Chron. 5. 14. & 7. 1, 2, 3. Ezek. 43. 5. Hag. 2. 7, 9. Mal. 3. 1.

versal terms—‘There I will meet with the children of Israel;’ with *all* of them; they shall *all* have the benefit of this high distinction. Chal. ‘And I will appoint my Word unto you, that he may speak with you there.’ This promise is still farther amplified in what follows; ‘And the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory.’ Heb. נִקְדַּשׁ בְּכִבְדִּי *nikdash bikbodi*; where the verb has no specific nominative, leaving us to understand the expression in its largest sense, as implying that *every thing*, people, tabernacle, altar, and priesthood, should be illustriously hallowed by the glory of the divine presence, the visible symbol of which was to be seen in the Shekinah enthroned in the Most Holy Place. It will be observed that the marginal reading of the English Bible is, ‘*Israel* shall be sanctified.’ This is very admissible grammatically, and is no doubt favored by the parallel promise, Ezek. 37. 28, to which the present has clearly an ultimate or typical reference, ‘And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do *sanctify Israel*, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.’ As the *glory* of God is in a great measure identified with his *tabernacle* in which it dwelt, the *sanctifying* virtue of the one was that of the other, so that the two passages are plainly of kindred import. But this interpretation makes no less *true* or *pertinent* the remark of Henry, that ‘*what* is sanctified *to* the glory of God, shall be sanctified *by* his glory.’

44 And I will sanctify the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar: I will <sup>c</sup> sanctify also both Aaron and his sons, to minister to me in the priest’s office.

45 And <sup>d</sup> I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God.

<sup>c</sup> Lev. 21. 15. & 22. 9, 16. <sup>d</sup> Exod. 25. 8. Lev. 26. 12. Zech. 2. 10. John 14. 17, 23. 2 Cor. 6. 16. Rev. 21. 3.

45. *And I will dwell among the children of Israel, &c.* Heb. וְשִׁכְנִיתִי *veshakanti*, and I will tabernacle. Chal. ‘I will make my majesty (שְׁכִינָתִי *shekinti*, my *shekinah*) to dwell in the midst of the children of Israel.’ The ‘Shekinah’ here is the same as the Word of v. 42, according to the same version. On the peculiar force of this word and its etymological relations, see Note on Ex. 25. 8, where we have expounded at some length what we conceive to be the genuine import of this promise. Its primary fulfilment was the grand central fact in the history of the Jewish people for century after century, as long as their national polity continued. To this peculiar indwelling among the chosen race the tabernacle and the temple were entirely subservient. They were each in its turn the palace of the Great King. It was not simply a *spiritual* but a *sensible* residence of the Deity, which hallowed those sacred structures. That this mode of habitation and manifestation was indeed typical of a future indwelling of God by his enlightening Spirit in the hearts of men, cannot be questioned. It is a view of the subject expressly recognised by the apostle, 2 Cor. 6. 16, ‘For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.’ But nothing is clearer from the prophecies, than that this form of fulfilment does not *exhaust* the rich

46 And they shall know that <sup>e</sup>I  
am the LORD their God, that brought  
<sup>e</sup> ch. 20. 2.

them forth out of the land of Egypt,  
that I may dwell among them: I  
am the LORD their God.

purport of the promise. It is a promise no less made to Israel in their *future restoration*, than at their *original adoption*; and in that relation is no less literally to be understood, though far more gloriously, than in the present announcement. So far as we are able to see, the literal restoration and return of the Jews are assured to us by no other principles of interpretation, than those which require us to admit the literal return and re-establishment of the manifested glory of Jehovah, the true Shekinah, in visible communication with the children of men on earth. Let the following passages, for instance, be taken as a specimen: Zech. 2. 10—12, 'Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of thee (שְׁכַנְתִּי shakanti), saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee (שְׁכַנְתִּי shakanti), and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land, and shall choose Jerusalem again.' Ezek. 37. 21—28, 'And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions; but I will save them out of all their dwelling-places, wherein they have sinned, and will

cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt, and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle (מִשְׁכָּן mishkan) also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.' We have given this extract at full length, because there is scarcely in the whole compass of the Scriptures a more direct and unequivocal prediction of the *literal* return of the Jews to their own land, than is to be found in these words. That it is a return yet future is clear from the fact; (1.) That the two grand divisions of the nation, the houses of Judah and Israel, are both to be restored, which it is well known was not the case at the return from Babylon. No past period can be assigned when this prediction can be fairly said to have been fulfilled. (2.) They are to be gathered under the headship of 'David their king,' which is undoubtedly the mystical denomination of the Messiah. He is probably here called 'David' more especially because he shall reign over the two united nations of Judah and Israel, as did the

## CHAPTER XXX.

AND thou shalt make <sup>a</sup>an altar <sup>b</sup>to burn incense upon: of shittim-wood shalt thou make it.

<sup>a</sup>ch. 37. 25. & 40. 5. <sup>b</sup> See ver. 7. 8, 10. Lev. 4. 7, 18. Rev. 8. 3.

literal David before the kingdom was divided. That Christ will ever rule over his people *by this title* in any other world than the present, we can gather no evidence from the Scriptures. Accordingly Newcome remarks upon the passage, that 'it favors the supposition that Christ will hereafter assume royal state on earth among the converted Jews.' (3.) It is said, v. 25, 'They shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children, *for ever*; and my servant David shall be their prince *for ever*.' Even though this language should be taken to mean something short of absolute eternity, yet it is clear that it has never yet been fulfilled. Consequently its fulfilment is still future; and we are utterly unable to see why it is not quite as certain that the *visible glory* will be restored to the land of promise as that the *chosen people* will. If further evidence of this be necessary we find it in Ezek. 43, 1—4, which is a prediction having respect to the destinies of the Jewish race in the latter day, after their re-establishment in the land of their fathers; 'Afterward he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looketh toward the east: And behold, *the glory of the God of Israel* came from the way of the east: and his voice was like a noise of many waters: and the earth shined with his glory. And it was according to the appearance of the vision which I saw, even according to the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city: and the visions were like the visions that I saw by the river Chebar; and I fell upon my face. And the *glory of the Lord* came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is toward

2 A cubit *shall be* the length thereof, and a cubit the breadth thereof; four-square shall it be; and two cubits *shall be* the height thereof: the horns thereof *shall be* of the same.

the east.' This is no other, as will appear upon strict examination, than the glory of the Shekinah which dwelt between the Cherubim in the Temple, and which on account of the sins of the nation had forsaken its ancient dwelling-place, Ezek. 10. 18—20, but which is here announced as again returning to its vacated habitation. This glory, however, will be the glory of the person of Christ, in whom the shadow of the Shekinah is turned into substance. It is this which constitutes the criterion of identity between the prophetic Jerusalem of Ezekiel and that of John in the Apocalypse; 'And he showed me that great city the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, *having the glory of God*.' But in regard to this sublime annunciation we must for the present rest contented with the simple *fact* assured to us. The *manner* of its accomplishment is hidden by a veil which only the developements of time and providence can remove.

## CHAPTER XXX.

## THE ALTAR OF INCENSE.

1, 2. *Thou shalt make an altar to burn incense upon.* Heb. מזבֹּחַ מִקְטָר mizbēah miktār ketoreth, *an incense-altar of incense*; or, *an altar, a perfumatory of perfume*. Gr. θυμιαστήριον θυμιάματος, *an altar of incense*. Chal. 'Thou shalt make an altar to offer upon it incense of sweet spices.' The original implies an altar on which odorous substances were to be burnt and resolved into a fragrant and grateful fume. In the subsequent account of its construction, Ex. 37. 25, it is called simply an 'altar of incense,' as



3 And thou shalt overlay it with pure gold, the top thereof, and the sides thereof round about, and the

rendered by the Greek here, and in Num. 4. 11, 'the golden altar,' as the other covered with brass was called 'the brazen altar.' But as the Hebrew term for altar (מִזְבֵּחַ *mizbēah*, from זָבַח *zabach*, to slay), legitimately carries with it the idea of *slain sacrifices*, and as no such service was performed upon this, it is for distinction sake termed מִקְטָר *miktār*, from קָטַר *katar*, to fume, to fumigate, to make to smoke. The practice of burning incense upon altars as a religious rite is to be traced to a very remote antiquity; but we have nothing *more* ancient in the way of historic record relative to this custom than what the present chapter contains. It seems scarcely probable, however, that the custom originated on this occasion in the order here prescribed. Incense altars appear in the most ancient Egyptian paintings, and when it was required to be compounded 'after the art of the apothecary (perfumer),' it would seem to be implied that this was an art which was practised, and which the Israelites had learned, in Egypt. Plutarch moreover assures us, that the Egyptians offered incense to the sun—resin in the morning, myrrh at noon, and about sunset an aromatic compound which they called *kypi*. But the custom was in ancient times by no means confined to Egypt. It pervaded all the religions of antiquity, and like many other features of the Hebrew worship may have been derived from an antediluvian origin. Nor are we disposed to overlook the circumstance in this connexion of incense being burnt among the Orientals by way of honorary tribute to kings, princes, and persons of distinction. It is one of the usages peculiar to palaces, and the houses of the wealthy and great, and as God in the character of Theocratic


horns thereof; and thou shalt make unto it a crown of gold round about.

Ruler of Israel saw fit to be honored in modes analogous to those which were common in reference to eastern sovereigns, so he would not have *his* palace, the Sanctuary, to be lacking in a usage of such striking significancy. But we shall hope to evince in the sequel that this came far short of fulfilling *all* the symbolical purposes which were answered by this remarkable portion of the furniture of the Tabernacle. Of the remark of Maimonides that incense was burnt in the Tabernacle to counteract the offensive smell of the sacrifices, we can only say, that although this may have been to a very limited degree the *effect* of the ordinance, it fell altogether short of being its main *object*. As to its materials and form this Altar was made like the Ark of shittim-wood overlaid with plates of gold. When it is said to have been 'four-square,' the meaning is, not that it was, as a whole, of a cubical form, but that upon its upper and under surface it showed four equal sides. It was, however, twice as *high* as it was *broad*, being twenty-one inches broad, and three feet six inches high. From the four corner posts arose four *horns* or *pinnales*, doubtless of similar form to those of the altar of sacrifice, which were covered with gold like the rest, and its top was surrounded with an ornamental ledge or border of solid gold, here called 'a crown,' like that which adorned the upper edges of the Ark of the Covenant and of the Table of Shewbread. Beneath this were placed two golden rings, probably on the opposite corners, for the conveniency of carrying it on staves during the marches of Israel in the wilderness, and afterwards when removed to different places in Canaan.

3. *The top thereof.* Heb. גִּגְגּוֹ *gaggo*, *his*

roof; implying that its top was fashioned like the flat roofs of eastern houses. These were furnished with parapets, battlements, or balustrades, to which the border or crown of the altar bore, on a small scale, a striking resemblance. The rendering of the Gr. *εσχαραν*, *hearth*, and the Lat. Vulg. 'Craticula' *grate*, is entirely erroneous, as the original word is different from that applied to the *grate* of the brazen altar (מכבד)

*mikbar*), and there is not the least mention made of cleansing the Altar from ashes, or of any thing to receive them. The incense was not burnt upon a grate, but in a golden censer which was placed, filled with coals, upon the Altar, so that no ashes or refuse whatever fell upon the Altar.—π *The sides thereof*. Heb. קירתייר *kirothauv*, *his walls*; in continued analogy with the structure of a house.



THE ALTAR OF INCENSE.

'The mystical design of the Altar of Incense now demands attention. Its primary use is sufficiently evident from its name, and from what is said in the subsequent verses. As the Table was for the Bread, the Candlestick for the Lights, and the brazen Altar for the Sacrifices, so the golden Altar was for the Incense which was to be burnt upon it. Now that the general import of *incense* as a symbol was that of *prayer*, cannot be questioned by any one who casts his eye over the following passages; Ps. 141. 2, 'Let my *prayer* be set forth before thee (as) *incense*; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice. Rev. 5. 8, 'And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them lamps and golden vials full of odors, which

*are the prayers of saints.*' Again, Rev. 8. 3, 4, 'And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it *with the prayers of all saints* upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand.' Here it is evidently implied that while the sacerdotal angel was officiating at the golden Altar, the saints were to be at the same time engaged in offering up prayers which might, as it were, mingle with the fragrant incense, and both come up in a grateful and acceptable cloud before God. In like manner it is said, Luke, 1. 9, 10, that while Zechariah was 'executing the priest's office according to

the custom, his lot was 'o burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord. And the whole multitude of the people *were praying without at the time of incense.*' Here the two services were performed together, the one being an emblem of the other. As then the idea of *prayer* is prominent in the symbolical purport of the act of offering incense, we may safely consider the *intercessory* office of Christ in heaven as primarily shadowed forth by the golden Altar and its Levitical uses. As the brazen Altar which was placed *without* the sanctuary typified his *sacrifice*, which was made on earth, so the Altar of Incense stationed *within* the sanctuary represented his *interceding* work above, where he has gone to appear in the presence of God for us, and where his intercession is as sweet-smelling savor. This is to be inferred from the fact that it occupied a *place*—directly before the mercy seat—which represented the appropriate sphere of the Savior's *present* mediatorial functions. Whatever service was performed by the priests *within the precincts of the Tabernacle* had a more special and emphatic reference to Christ's work *in heaven*; whereas their duties in the outer court had more of an *earthly* bearing, representing the oblations which were made *on the part of sinners*, and on behalf of sinners, *to the holy majesty of Jehovah*. As, however, scarcely any of the objects or rites of the ancient economy had an *exclusive* typical import, but combined many in one, so in the present case, nothing forbids us to consider the prayers and devotions of the saints as also symbolically represented by the incense of the golden Altar. As a matter of fact, they *do* pray below while Christ intercedes above; their prayers mingle with his; and it is doing no violence to the symbol to suppose their spiritual desires, kindled by the fire of holy love, to be significantly set forth by the uprising

clouds of incense, which every morning and evening filled the holy place of the sanctuary with its grateful perfume.

Still it may be doubted whether the full and complete design of the golden Altar as a symbol can be reached, without assigning to it, as well as to the Candlestick and the Table, a *prospective* reference. Can it be in keeping with the rest of the furniture of the Tabernacle, unless it points to the heavenly state as yet to be developed? *There* no Altar of sacrifice is found, because the one offering of the Savior was consummated in his oblation of himself upon the cross. But the Altar of Incense is there, and it bears a name (מִזְבֵּחַ *mizbēah*), the leading idea of which is that of *slain sacrifice*. Why is this idea to be carried forward into the upper sanctuary in connexion with a structure intended mainly as a shadow of *prayer, thanksgiving, and praise*? Why, but to intimate that there is still, and is ever to be, to the saints a real and indissoluble connexion between the *atonement* of Christ and the *praises and doxologies* in which they are engaged in heaven?—between *acquittal from guilt and acceptance to favor*? Were it not for the virtue of his *atoning sacrifice* how could they be in heaven to *praise* him at all? In the ministrations of the earthly sanctuary, the coals on which the incense was burnt on the golden Altar were to be taken from the brazen Altar. This taught the Israelite from whence the efficacy and acceptableness of their prayers and praises was derived. So in the heavenly sanctuary, the instrument of incense is called by the otherwise inappropriate name of *altar* (sacrificatory) to keep its blessed inhabitants in mind of the fact, that the *blood of atonement* and the *fire of sacrifice*, must be for ever that which imparts all its grateful fragrance to the songs, ascriptions, and hallelujahs of the ransomed throng in glory.

4 And two golden rings shalt thou make to it under the crown of it, by the two corners thereof, upon the two sides of it shalt thou make it; and they shall be for places for the staves to bear it withal.

5 And thou shalt make the staves of shittim-wood, and overlay them with gold.

6 And thou shalt put it before the vail that is by the ark of the testimony, before the <sup>c</sup>mercy-seat that is over the testimony, where I will meet with thee.

<sup>c</sup> ch. 25. 21, 22.

6. *Thou shalt put it before the vail, &c.* That is, before the separating vail suspended between the Holy and Most Holy Place of the Tabernacle. It would of course be 'before the mercy-seat,' though the Vail interposed. It was stationed about midway between the Candlestick and Table of Shew-bread, though considerably nearer to the Vail than either.

7, 8. *Aaron shall burn thereon sweet incense every morning.* Heb. קטרת סמים *ketoreth sammim*, incense of spices. Gr. θυμίαμα συνθετον λεπτον, incense delicately compounded. It might seem from the letter, that Aaron or the High Priest alone was entitled to burn incense on this Altar. But the word 'Aaron' is often used to designate the whole priestly order. There is no doubt that Aaron did in person perform this service on the present occasion, and the High Priest, whoever he was, did the same on other great occasions; but it was ordinarily executed by the inferior priests in their courses. Whatever priest was appointed by lot to be in waiting during the week, he every morning and evening filled his censer with fire from the brazen Altar, and introducing the sacred incense went into the holy place and set the censer upon the Altar. As the daily sacrifice represented the perpetual efficacy of Christ's

7 And Aaron shall burn thereon <sup>d</sup>sweet incense every morning: when <sup>e</sup>he dresseth the lamps, he shall burn incense upon it.

8 And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at even, he shall burn incense upon it; a perpetual incense before the LORD, throughout your generations.

9 Ye shall offer no <sup>f</sup>strange incense thereon, nor burnt-sacrifice, nor meat-offering; neither shall ye pour drink-offering thereon.

<sup>d</sup> ver. 34. <sup>1</sup> Sam. 2. 28. <sup>1</sup> Chron. 23. 13. Luke 1. 9. <sup>e</sup> ch. 27. 21. <sup>f</sup> Lev. 10. 1.

atonement, so the burning of incense morning and evening typified his continual intercession for us. This offered incense was called a 'perpetual incense' because it was regularly offered at the appointed time without cessation. By a like phraseology we are exhorted to 'pray without ceasing,' i. e. to continue in the daily practice of prayer without omitting it. The command to have the incense burnt at the same time that the lamps were dressed gives occasion to Henry to remark in his ordinary spiritualizing vein, that it was designed 'to teach us, that the reading of the Scriptures, which are our light and lamp, is a part of our daily work, and should accompany our prayers and praises. When we speak to God, we must hear what God says to us, and thus the communion is complete.'—π *When Aaron lighteth.* Heb. בהעלת be-ha'äloth, when he causeth to ascend; a phraseology the ground of which is explained in the Note on Ex. 27. 20.—π *At even.* Heb. בין הערבים b'n ha-arbayim, between the two evenings. See Note on Ex. 12. 16.

9. *Ye shall offer no strange incense thereon.* That is, incense of a different composition from that prescribed, v. 34. Gr. θυμίαμα ἕτερον, another incense. Chal. 'Incense of strange spices.' The incense was to be that alone which God

10 And  $\text{g}$  Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it once in a year, with the blood of the sin-offering of atonements: once in the year shall he make

$\text{g}$  Lev. 16. 18. & 23. 27.

had appointed; and special care was to be taken to make no confusion between the offerings belonging to the respective altars, of which the one kind was for *atonement*, the other for *acceptance* only. So when drawing nigh to God in prayer, we are not to bring the fervor of mere animal spirits, which may easily be mistaken for true devotion; but a broken and a contrite heart, which alone sends forth an odor that is well-pleasing to God. Nor are we to imagine that by our *prayers*, or by any thing else that we can bring to God, we can *atone* for sin, or contribute in the least degree towards the efficacy of Christ's atonement. These must be kept quite distinct; and whilst our prayers are offered on the Altar of Incense, our pleas must be taken solely from the Altar of Burnt-offering.

10. *Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once in a year.* This was to be upon what was called the great day of Atonement, of which a full account is given Lev. 10. 1—28. The ordinance was peculiarly striking, as it intimated that all the services performed at it were imperfect, that the Altar itself had contracted a degree of impurity from the sinfulness of those who ministered there, and that even the very odors of the daily incense needed to be sweetened by a fresh infusion of the savor of the blood of sprinkling.—This mention of atonement made upon the horns of the Altar affords a fair occasion for an attempted explication of a passage in the Apocalypse, c. 9. 13, 14, which commentators have for the most part passed over with a very superficial notice; 'And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns

atonement upon it throughout your generations: it is most holy unto the LORD.

11 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

of the golden Altar which is before God, saying to the sixth angel who had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates.' The question is, What is implied in the fact of this voice being represented as proceeding from the four 'horns of the golden Altar?' In answer to this it may be observed, that the cases mentioned Ex. 21. 24. 1 Kings, 1. 50. 1 Kings, 2. 28, clearly evince that the horns of the Altar were constituted an asylum for those who had been guilty of undesigned transgressions. It is true indeed that in these instances allusion seems to be had more especially to the Altar of holocausts standing in the court of the Tabernacle, but as the blood of atonement was sprinkled in like manner upon the horns of both the brazen and the golden altar, it is to be inferred, we imagine, by a parity of reasoning that the horns of the Altar are in general a symbol of divine protection, or of a secure sanctuary for those whose crimes are of a remissible nature. But as the sin to be punished by the voice of the sixth trumpet was that of idolatry, as appears from Rev. 9. 20, & 11, which in a whole people is less pardonable in the sight of God than any other, the voice issuing from the four horns of the golden Altar, is a virtual proclamation that God was about to withdraw his protection from a portion of idolatrous Christendom, and to send upon it a plague of far more desolating character than that of the locusts which had preceded. For in the case of the locust-war, commandment was given that men should be tormented, but not killed. But in that of the sixth trumpet, the Euphratean horsemen were appointed

12 <sup>h</sup> When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man <sup>ia</sup> a ransom for his soul unto the LORD, when thou numberest them: that there be no <sup>k</sup> plague among them when *thou* numberest them.

13 <sup>i</sup> This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary: (<sup>m</sup> a shekel is twenty *gerahs*;) <sup>n</sup> an half shekel *shall be* the offering of the LORD.

<sup>h</sup> ch. 38. 25. Numb. 1. 2, 5. & 26. 2. 2 Sam. 24. 2. <sup>i</sup> Job 33. 24. & 36. 18. Ps. 49. 7. Matt. 20. 28. Mark 10. 45. 1 Tim. 2. 6. 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. <sup>k</sup> 2 Sam. 24. 15. 1 Matt. 17. 24. <sup>m</sup> Lev. 27. 25. Numb. 3. 47. Ezek. 45. 12. <sup>n</sup> ch. 38. 26.

ed to *slay* the third part of men. The voice therefore in this vision of the prophet is to be understood as a sign that neither atonement nor protection were any longer to be afforded by the horns of the Altar to those who were the destined victims of the impending judgments. The consequence was that a great part of degenerate Christendom was speedily overrun by myriads of the Turkish cavalry, carrying wasting and destruction in their progress.

#### THE ATONEMENT-MONEY, OR RANSOM-TAX.

12—16. *When thou takest the sum, &c.* That is, when thou makest a census; which Moses is not indeed here expressly *commanded* to do, but which it is supposed, from its intrinsic utility and propriety, he *would* do, as would also his successors in the government of Israel in after ages. It seems to be a general direction as to the mode of raising the requisite revenues for supporting the expenses of the Tabernacle worship. The original *building* and *furnishing* the sanctuary was provided for by the voluntary contributions of

14 Every one that passeth among them that are numbered, from twenty years old and above, shall give an offering unto the LORD.

15 The <sup>o</sup> rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel, when *they* give an offering unto the LORD to make an <sup>p</sup> atonement for your souls.

16 And thou shalt take the atonement-money of the children of Israel, and <sup>q</sup> shalt appoint it for the service of the tabernacle of the congregation; that it may be <sup>r</sup> a memorial unto the children of Israel before the LORD, to make an atonement for your souls.

• Job 34. 19. Prov. 22. 2. Ephes. 6. 9. Col. 3. 25. P ver. 12. <sup>q</sup> ch. 38. 25. <sup>r</sup> Numb. 16. 40.

the people; but the necessary charges for *sustaining* the worship now to be established were to be defrayed from other sources, and the present or<sup>er</sup> seems to come in as a kind of reply to the question which would be naturally but tacitly asked, 'How are the inevitable expenses of such a system of worship to be met?' The passage before us contains the desired information. The Most High foreseeing that the custom of taking a census, not annually perhaps, but occasionally, would obtain among the chosen people, now orders that an assessment, or poll-tax, of half a shekel each, should be grafted upon this custom, and that this should be the ordinary revenue for the support of the ritual. But why is this tax called a 'ransom or atonement (<sup>s</sup> כפר *kephor*) for the soul?' The word 'atonement' naturally suggests the idea of *expiation for sin*; but can silver or gold or any thing short of the blood of the 'Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' avail to propitiate the justice of God, and serve as a 'ransom for the soul?' The true answer to the question depends upon a correct inter-

17 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

pretation of the language. 'The term 'soul' in this connexion is equivalent to 'life,' 'person,' 'self,' as explained in the Note on Gen. 14. 21. It was therefore a *ransom for their lives*, or in other words, a tribute paid to God by way of acknowledgment that they had originally received their lives from him, that they had forfeited their lives to him, and that their continued preservation in being under these circumstances was owing to his more sovereign forbearance and patience; and that consequently he might most justly claim from them whatever he might see fit to demand, for the support of institutions of which they themselves at the same time were to reap the great advantage. The payment of the tax of half a shekel, therefore, was an act of homage to their sovereign Lord, by which they would express their dependence upon him for their spared lives and continued mercies, and deprecate those plagues and judgments which their sins had deserved. This tax was to be assessed upon those who were twenty years old and upward, women, minors, and probably very old men being exempted; and by the same sum being fixed for all, rich and poor, it was strongly intimated that all lives, or persons, were in the sight of God of *equal value*. So in the higher atonement which Christ has wrought, the same price had to be paid for the soul of the lowest, weakest, meanest believer, as for the greatest philosopher, prince, or potentate that shall taste of his salvation.—¶ *Every one that passeth among them*. In allusion perhaps to the customary mode of numbering and marking flocks of sheep, which were made to *pass* before the numberer that he might count them one by one. See Note on Lev. 27. 32. Comp. Jer. 33. 13.—¶ *Shekel of the*

18 <sup>s</sup>Thou shalt also make a

<sup>s</sup> ch. 38. 8. 1 Kings 7. 38.

*sanctuary*. So called, it is supposed, from the fact of the standard of weights and measures being kept in the sanctuary. This might have been the case under the Temple, but it seems in the highest degree unlikely that such a custom obtained at this early period. And yet we know of no *other* reason for the use of this peculiar designation. On the name and value of the ancient Hebrew shekel see Note on Gen. 20. 16. A half a shekel was not far from twenty-five cents of our money.—¶ *That it may be a memorial unto the children of Israel before the Lord*. That is, a memorial at once *of* them and *for* them; a memorial testifying to their obedience, and reminding them of what they owed to their heavenly Benefactor. We read of different memorials in the sacred Scriptures. The censers in which Korah and his company offered incense were taken out of the fire in which the offerers perished, and made into plates to be a covering of the altar; 'to be a *memorial* that none but the seed of Aaron come near to offer incense before the Lord.' The jewels and bracelets of which the Israelites spoiled the slaughtered Midianites were presented to the Lord 'as a *memorial* unto the children of Israel,' that not one of their army fell, though the whole Midianitish kingdom was utterly destroyed. So the half shekels at the numbering of the people would serve as a remembrancer of all the interesting facts connected with the occasion of their past deliverance, of the fulfilment of the divine promises, and of their future preservation and blessedness under the favor of heaven.

#### THE LAVER.

18. *Thou shalt make a laver of brass,* &c. Heb. כִּיּוֹר *kiyor*, rendered 'cal-dron,' 1 Sam. 2. 14, but usually spoken

laver of brass, and his foot *also* of brass, to wash *withal*: and thou shalt put it between the taber-

<sup>t</sup> ch. 40. 7, 30.

of a large basin or other vessel for washing. In respect to none of the sacred articles is the information of the text more brief than in respect to this, as nothing is said of its form or dimensions. It is reasonable, however, to infer, that as Solomon modelled the furniture of the Temple after that of the Tabernacle, only on a vastly larger scale, and as his Laver was an immense vat or reservoir, called 'a sea,' and of a circular form, so the form of the Tabernacle-laver was also circular. De Dieu infers the same from the fact, that the analogous Arabic word is used to denote vessels of that form, and to this inference we have nothing to object. The original word rendered *foot* (כֶּן *kēn*) has a meaning not easily determined. Some interpreters understand it of a *lid* or *cover*, but as the root has the sense of *establishing*, *fixing*, *founding* any thing, we prefer to consider it as importing in this connexion a *basis*, *pediment*, or *supporter* upon which the Laver rested. As the cut which we have given below is substantially the same with that of the Pictorial Bible, and adopted for a like reason, we cite the words of the Editor as conveying on the whole that view of the subject which we consider the most correct. 'Our impression is, that the Laver, whatever were its shape, stood upon another basin, more wide and shallow, as a cup on a saucer; and that the latter received, from cocks or spouts in the upper basin, the water which was allowed to escape when the priests washed themselves with the water which fell from the upper basin. If by the under basin we understand the 'foot' of the text, the sense is clear. The text does not say that the priests were to wash *themselves* in the basin,

nacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein.

but *at* it. In it they could not well wash their hands and feet if the Laver was of any height. The Rabbins say the Laver had several cocks, or, 'nipples,' as they call them, from which the water was let out as wanted. There were several such spouts, but the number is differently stated. How the priests washed their hands and feet at the Laver seems uncertain. That they did not wash in either the Laver or its base seems clear, because then the water in which they washed would have been rendered impure by those who washed before or with them; and as we know that Orientals do not like to wash in a basin, after our manner, in which the water with which we commence washing is clearer than that with which we finish, but at a falling stream, where each successive affusion is of clean water, we incline to think that the priests either washed themselves with the stream as it fell from the spouts into the base, or else received in proper vessels so much water as they needed for the occasion. The Orientals, in their washings, make use of a vessel with a long spout, and wash at the stream which issues from thence, the waste water being received in a basin which is placed underneath. This seems to us to illustrate the idea of the Laver with its base, as well as the ablutions of the priests. The Laver had thus its upper basin, from which the stream fell, and the under basin for receiving the waste water; or it is quite compatible with the same idea and practice to suppose that, to prevent too great an expenditure of water, they received a quantity in separate vessels, using it as described, and the base receiving the water which in washing fell from their hands and feet. This ex-



19 For Aaron and his sons <sup>u</sup>shall wash their hands and their feet thereat:

20 When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not: or when they come near

<sup>u</sup> ch. 40. 31, 32. Ps. 26. 6. Isai. 52. 11. John 13. 10. Heb. 10. 22.

planation, although it seems to us probable, is, necessarily, little more than conjectural. Our cut exhibits another view more in conformity with the usual interpretations. The Jewish commentators say that any kind of water might be used for the Laver; but that the water was to be changed every day. They also state that ablution before

to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the LORD:

21 So they shall wash their hands and their feet, that they die not: and <sup>w</sup> it shall be a statute for ever to them, *even* to him and to his seed throughout their generations.

<sup>w</sup> ch. 28. 43.

entering the Tabernacle was in no case dispensed with. A man might be perfectly clean, might be quite free from any ceremonial impurity, and might even have washed his hands and feet before he left home, but still he could by no means enter the Tabernacle without previous ablution at the Laver.<sup>7</sup>



THE LAVER.

The typical design of the Laver flows so naturally out of its primary uses, that but little room is left for a formal discussion of the subject. The external ablution of the body with water, either in whole or in part, was a significant mode of teaching the necessity of an inward purification of the spirit. Those who were officially engaged in the services of the Sanctuary were especially to be reminded of the duty of preserving purity in all their ministrations, and of dreading the pollutions of sin. It was only thus that their functions could be

available to themselves. Their *feet* trod the hallowed precincts of the Holy Place, and their *hands* offered the sacrifices upon the altar, and to these members, therefore, in lieu of their whole bodies, was this washing to be especially applied. The position of the Laver was between the Tabernacle and the Altar, as an intermediate something which had an important relation to the entrance within the outer vail. In passing from the Altar of Sacrifice to the interior of the Sanctuary, the priest was, as it were, arrested by the

22 ¶ Moreover, the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

23 Take thou also unto thee <sup>x</sup> principal spices, of pure <sup>y</sup> myrrh five hundred *shekels*, and of sweet cinnamon half so much, *even* two

<sup>x</sup> Cant. 4. 14. Ezek. 27. 22. <sup>y</sup> Ps. 45. 8. Prov. 7. 17.

Laver, at which he was previously to pause and perform the requisite personal cleansings. Thus too there is no entering into heaven, the upper sanctuary, without a previous washing in the *laver of regeneration*. The renewing and purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, not only at the outset, but through the whole course of the Christian life, are most significantly shadowed forth by this feature of the ancient economy. Indeed, we may say in brief that as the Altar on which the victims were offered was a symbol of *justification*, so the Laver, with its cleansing fountain, was a symbol of *sanctification*; and among the moral truths so impressively taught by the sensible emblems of the Mosaic ritual, none was perhaps more pertinently or palpably set forth than the strict connexion between the *atoning blood* of Christ and the *sanctifying efficacy* of the Holy Spirit in this mutual relation of these articles standing in the outer court. It is a relation which seems to be expressly recognised by David when he says, Ps. 26. 6, 'I will wash mine hands in innocency, so will I compass thine altar, O Lord.' The same truth is taught in the New Testament, where we are told that Christ came both by *water* and by *blood*.—the one to *atone* and the other to *purify*—and beyond this it is not needful to seek for the typical mystery of the Laver.

#### THE HOLY ANOINTING OIL.

23, 24. Take thou unto the principal spices, &c. Heb. בשמים ראש *besamim rosh*, head spices; intimating that the

hundred and fifty *shekels*, and of sweet <sup>z</sup> calamus two hundred and fifty *shekels*.

24 And of <sup>a</sup> cassia, five hundred *shekels*, after the shekel of the sanctuary, and of oil-olive an <sup>b</sup> hin:

<sup>z</sup> Cant. 4. 14. Jer. 6. 20. <sup>a</sup> Ps. 45. 8. <sup>b</sup> ch. 29. 40.

several spices which formed the ingredients of the anointing oil were to be of the very best kinds then known and valued. These we may consider in their order.—¶ *Pure myrrh*. Heb. מר דרור *mar deror*, *myrrh of freedom*; i. e. myrrh which flowed freely and spontaneously, instead of being drawn by incision, and was therefore of the purest kind.—¶ *Sweet cinnamon*. Hebrew קנמן בשם *kinnemon besem*, *aromatic cinnamon*, a well-known article of spicery deriving its name directly from the Hebrew. The word is ordinarily used to denote the second or inner bark of the cinnamon-tree which grows in great abundance in the island of Ceylon. But as the bark of the root has a stronger flavor than that of the trunk, Scheuzer conjectures that that which was employed in the composition of the holy anointing oil was of the former kind.—¶ *Sweet calamus*. Heb. קנה בשם *kenēh bosem*, *spiced cane*. This term denotes an aromatic reed growing in moist places in Egypt, in Judea near lake Gennesareth, and in several parts of Syria. It grows to about two feet in height; bearing from the root a knotted stalk, quite round, containing in its cavity a soft, white pith. The whole is of an agreeable aromatic smell; and the plant is said to scent the air with fragrance, even while growing. When cut down, dried, and powdered, it makes an ingredient in the richest perfumes.—¶ *Cassia*. Heb. קדרה *kiddah*; but as the Shemitic *d* and *z* are closely related in sound, the word is otherwise written *kitzia*, from which comes the Gr. *κασσία*, and thence the

25 And thou shalt make it an oil of holy ointment, an ointment compound after the art of the apothecary: it shall be <sup>e</sup> an holy anointing oil.

26 <sup>d</sup> And thou shalt anoint the tabernacle of the congregation therewith, and the ark of the testimony.

27 And the table and all his ves-

<sup>c</sup> ch. 37. 29. Numb. 35. 25. Ps. 89. 20. & 133. 2. <sup>d</sup> ch. 40. 9. Lev. 8. 10. Numb. 7. 1.

English, *cassia*. We find in the Scriptures no mention of this article except here and Ezek. 27. 19, where it is joined with calamus and enumerated among the precious things which were brought from the mart of Tyre.

25—28. *Thou shalt make it an oil of holy ointment*. The quantity of oil was sufficient to retain the compound in a *liquid* state, which was probably much improved by straining off the dreggy parts and leaving the residuum defecated and pure. With this holy oil was the Tabernacle, with its priesthood and its furniture, to be anointed, as the last and crowning act of consecration. By this sacred unction the whole was sanctified and set apart to the uses for which it was designed. And as every thing to which it was applied became thereby *most holy*, so a peculiar sanctity attached to the anointing oil itself, which imparted this, and it was on peril of death that any of the same composition was made for any other purpose. But the tradition of the Jews, founded upon the phraseology of v. 31, 'throughout your generations,' that the very oil now prepared by Moses was preserved till near the captivity, and that none was to be made like it, not even for the same purpose, is undoubtedly erroneous. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that under the inspection of the High Priest it was made as often as it was wanted; nor do we see any objection to the idea that not only the

sels, and the candlestick and his vessels, and the altar of incense.

28 And the altar of burnt-offering with all his vessels, and the laver and his foot.

29 And thou shalt sanctify them, that they may be most holy: <sup>e</sup> whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.

30 <sup>f</sup> And thou shalt anoint Aaron

<sup>e</sup> ch. 29. 37. <sup>f</sup> ch. 29. 7, &c. Lev. 8. 12. 30.

priests but also the kings of Judah were anointed with it, although as that form of government was not especially contemplated at this time, nothing is said on this subject.

29. *Whatsoever toucheth them shall be most holy*. The two leading attributes of the anointing oil were its *preciousness* and its *sanctity*. The spices of which it was composed were peculiarly rare and odoriferous, and the oil with which they were blended was most pure. This was doubtless intended to shadow forth the excellency of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, whose distinguishing emblem under the old economy was *oil*. And what is to be compared with the preciousness of those divine influences which emanate from this source? Upon whomsoever they are poured forth, they impart light to the understanding, pliancy to the will, purity to the affections, tenderness to the conscience, and holiness to the entire man. There is nothing beside them to be so earnestly coveted or so advantageously possessed. They are the true riches of the soul, and the sealing title to an eternal inheritance. Wherever enjoyed they constitute the subject of them, 'a new creature,' and so far sanctify every offering which he presents, that 'God smells a sweet savor from it,' and is well pleased. And not only so. It is a diffusive blessedness which is thus conferred. As every vessel that was anointed with the holy ointment, im-

and his sons, and consecrate them, that *they* may minister unto me in the priest's office.

31 And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, This shall be an holy anointing oil unto me throughout your generations.

32 Upon man's flesh shall it not be poured, neither shall ye make *any other* like it, after the composition of it: *g* it is holy, *and* it shall be holy unto you.

*g* ver. 25. 37.

parted a sanctity to every thing with which it came in contact, so every true Christian communicates to others, as far as his influence extends, the same divine principles which he has imbibed. As was said in mystic language of the Savior, so may it be said of all his anointed ones, 'Their garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia,' and wherever they go they diffuse around them 'the savor of the knowledge of Christ.' Let us seek then this 'unction from the Holy One,' the 'crown of the anointing oil,' which sanctifies and separates all those upon whom it comes. Let us guard against any thing that would reflect dishonor upon the Holy Spirit. Let us bear in mind the striking admonition conveyed in the figurative style of Solomon; 'Dead flies cause the *ointment of the apothecary* to send forth a stinking savor; so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honor.' There is a sanctity about the Christian character which should be kept inviolate, and he that dishonors his calling puts fire to the oil of his consecration to his own consuming.

32. *Upon man's flesh shall it not be poured.* That is, upon common men, upon any who were not priests; equivalent to which is 'stranger' in the next verse.

#### THE HOLY PERFUME.

34. *Take unto thee sweet spices, &c.*

33 <sup>h</sup> Whosoever compoundeth *any* like it, or whosoever putteth *any* of it upon a stranger <sup>i</sup> shall even be cut off from his people.

34 ¶ And the Lord said unto Moses, <sup>k</sup> Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and galbanum; *these* sweet spices with pure frankincense: of each shall there be a like *weight*:

<sup>h</sup> ver. 33. <sup>i</sup> Gen. 17. 14. ch. 12. 15. Lev. 7. 20, 21. <sup>k</sup> ch 25. 6. & 37. 29.

This order has respect to the composition of the Incense which was to be burnt upon the golden Altar. This also was prepared of sweet spices, though not of so rare or precious a quality as those of which the anointing oil was compounded. But concerning both preparations the same law is given that nothing like them should be made for common use. This would tend to beget among the Israelites a reverence for whatever was of divine institution, and a sedulous care to guard against its profanation or abuse, and as to us, who are privileged to look deeper into the spiritual drift of the Mosaic economy, it may well admonish us to beware of any 'counterfeit presentment,' or any unhallowed prostitution, of those ordinances, gifts, or graces which emanate from the Spirit of God and in which his honor is especially concerned.—

¶ *Stacte.* Heb. נֶטָפֶה *netaph* from נָטַף *nataph*, to drop. Gr. στακτη, from σταζω, to distil. This was a fine kind of gum which was produced from the myrrh-tree, but differing from that substance mentioned v. 23, by retaining a waxy or resinous form, instead of flowing out as a liquid. It is supposed to have been the same with what was afterwards called 'opobalsam' or 'the balm of Jericho.'—¶ *Onycha.* Heb. שְׁהִילֶת *shehileth*, a word which occurs only in this place, and of which the true sense is consequently very difficult to be de-

35 And thou shalt make it a perfume, a confection <sup>1</sup>after the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure *and* holy:

36 And thou shalt beat *some* of it very small, and put of it before the testimony in the tabernacle of the congregation, <sup>m</sup>where I will meet with thee: <sup>n</sup>it shall be unto you most holy.

<sup>1</sup> ver. 25. <sup>m</sup> ch. 29. 42. Lev. 16. 2. <sup>n</sup> ver. 32. ch. 29. 37. Lev. 2. 3.

terminated. In Syriac שֶׁהֶלְטָא *shehelta*, is a *tear*, a *distillation*, and the Hebrew word would seem therefore to mean *something that exuded*, some vegetable gum of odorous qualities. The Gr. indeed has ονύχα, *onycha*, from ονύξ, *nail*, and several learned critics have supposed it to be the external covering (nail) of the shell-fish *purpura* or *murex*, which possessed aromatic properties and was thence called *unguis odoriferans*, *odoriferous onyx*. This, according to Rumphius, was the basis of the principal perfumes employed in India, just as *aloes* is the basis of all their pills. But as India was too distant for drugs to be brought from thence to Judea or Arabia, where the Israelites now were, and as the context and the etymology seem to require some *vegetable* substance, the opinion is far preferable that makes it the gum of some aromatic plant; and as the Arabic version has 'Ladana,' it is not improbable that *gum-ladanum*, the produce of the 'Cistus ladaniferus,' was the drug in question. This is a secretion from the leaves, which is swept off by the beard of the browsing goats, from whence it was collected. The shrub is a native of the Levant, the isles of the Mediterranean, and Arabia. —π *Galbanum*. Heb. חֶלְבָנָה *helbanah*, which Michaelis supposes to be a compound of חֶלֶב *heleb*, *milk* or *gum* and לָבָן *leben*, *white*, denoting the *white milk* or *gum* of some plant, as it is common with us to call the white

37 And *as for* the perfume which thou shalt make, <sup>o</sup>ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord.

38 <sup>p</sup>Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people.

<sup>o</sup> ver. 32. <sup>p</sup> ver. 33.

juice which exudes from certain plants the 'milk,' and the phraseology is retained in medical nomenclature 'gum lac, &c. The 'galbanum' is supposed to have been the gum-resin or thickened sap of the 'Bubon Gummiferum,' an umbelliferous plant of Turkey, which yields this gum in softish, pliant, and pale cream-colored masses, whenever a wound is made in any part of it. It is of a strong piercing smell, and of a bitterish taste.—π *Frankincense*. Heb. לְבָנָה *lebonah*, a term of which the root also is לָבֵן *labën* and conveying the idea of *whiteness*. The English word 'frankincense' is supposed to have the prefixed epithet 'frank,' *free*, from the *liberal* and *ready* distribution of its odors. This drug, otherwise called 'olibanum,' is a dry resinous substance of a yellowish white color, a strong fragrant smell, and bitter acrid taste. It is produced from the 'Boswellia serrata,' a native of India, and a fine tree belonging to the family of the turpentine-bearing trees. The 'pure frankincense' is that which is first obtained from the tree, and for that reason considered the best. When laid upon burning coals, or a hot iron, it sends forth a vapor of most delicious fragrance.

35. *Tempered together*. Heb. מִמֶּלֶח *memullah*, *salted*, from מֶלַח *melah*, *salt*. The Chal. and Gr., however, have set the example of rendering by *mixed* or *tempered*, as if their idea was that

## CHAPTER XXXI.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 <sup>a</sup> See, I have called by name Bezaleel the <sup>b</sup> son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah:

3 And I have <sup>c</sup> filled him with the

<sup>a</sup> ch. 35. 30. & 36. 1. <sup>b</sup> 1 Chron. 2. 20.  
<sup>c</sup> ch. 35. 31. 1 Kings 7. 14.

the different ingredients were to be mixed together just as salt is mixed with any substance on which it is sprinkled. Ainsworth contends for the liberal rendering, inasmuch as the law, Lev. 2. 13, expressly says, 'With all thine offerings *thou shalt offer salt.*' In support of this he quotes Maimonides, who affirms that 'there was not any thing offered on the Altar *without salt*, except the wine of the drink-offerings, and the blood, and the wood;' and of the incense he says still more expressly, that 'they added to it the fourth part of a kab of *salt.*' In accordance with which, it is supposed, our Savior says, Matt. 9. 49, 'Every sacrifice shall be *salted with salt.*' We feel incompetent to decide the question, but confess a leaning towards the view of Ainsworth, who further remarks very appropriately, that 'if our *speech* is to be always with grace, seasoned with salt, as the apostle teaches, Col. 4. 6, how much more should our incense, our *prayers* unto God, be therewith seasoned?'

## CHAPTER XXXI.

*The Workmen called.*

2. *I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri.* That is, I have especially designated, appointed, and set apart to the superintendence of this work Bezaleel the son of Uri. His name signifies 'under the shadow of God,' but that it has any particular significancy in this connexion we see no evidence. He was the seventh in descent from

spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship,

4 To devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass,

Judah, and the reader will find his genealogy expressly detailed, 1 Chron. 2. 5—20.

3. *I have filled him with the Spirit of God, &c.* That is, with those *intellectual* gifts and endowments which are immediately specified, and which amounted to something like a *divine inspiration*, but at the same time not implying any thing of a *moral* character, the usual result of the operation of the Spirit of God. Both he and his associates in the work were to be the subjects of an influence which should improve their faculties and endow them with an ingenuity and skill far beyond the utmost stretch of their unassisted powers. This extraordinary ability now to be imparted, infinite wisdom doubtless saw to be indispensable on the present occasion. The children of Israel had in Egypt been condemned to a hard bondage in brick and in mortar, and in all kinds of coarse, rough, and degrading labor, and consequently could not be supposed to be qualified for the curious workmanship which was now required. To engrave and to embroider, to work gold, to cut diamonds, and to mount jewels, would of course demand a degree of tact and dexterity for which, as they had served no previous apprenticeship at it, they must be indebted to a supernatural teaching. But he who had designed the work was abundantly able to qualify the workmen.

4. *To devise cunning work.* Heb. לחשב מחשבת *lahashob mahashoboth*, to think thoughts, or to ponder devices

5 And in cutting of stones to set *them*, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship.

6 And I, behold, I have given with him <sup>d</sup>Aholiab the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan; and in the hearts of all that are <sup>e</sup>wise-hearted I have put wisdom; that they may make all that I have commanded thee:

7 <sup>f</sup>The tabernacle of the congregation, and <sup>g</sup>the ark of the testimony, and <sup>h</sup>the mercy-seat that is thereupon, and all the furniture of the tabernacle,

8 And <sup>i</sup>the table and his furniture, and <sup>k</sup>the pure candlestick with all his furniture, and the altar of incense,

9 And <sup>l</sup>the altar of burnt-offer-

<sup>d</sup> ch. 35. 34. <sup>e</sup> ch. 28. 3. & 35. 10, 35. & 36. 1. <sup>f</sup> ch. 36. 8. <sup>g</sup> ch. 37. 1. <sup>h</sup> ch. 37. 5. <sup>i</sup> ch. 37. 10. <sup>k</sup> ch. 37. 17. <sup>l</sup> ch. 38. 1.

Gr. ἀρχιτεκτονῆσαι, lit. to architectonize. Chal. 'To teach artificers;' i. e. to act in the capacity of chief designer, director, and overseer, in executing the various works prescribed. The term does not, however, in this connexion imply that Bezaleel or any of his assistants were to exercise their ingenuity in *contriving* or *originating* any of the utensils or decorations of the Tabernacle. They were merely to execute the plans of the divine Draughtsman. But in doing this there was still room for the display of much mechanical tact, or *device*, in accomplishing every thing with exactness, readiness, and elegance.

5—11. *In carving of timber*, Heb. בַּחֲרֹשֶׁת *baharoshith*, from חָרַשׁ *harash*, which has the general sense of *making incisions*, or *furrows*, whether by a *ploughshare in the soil*, or by a *graving tool in metal, wood, or stone*. It is the same word with that rendered 'cutting' in the preceding clause, which has reference mainly to the *engraving of*

ing with all his furniture, and <sup>m</sup>the laver and his foot,

10 And <sup>n</sup>the clothes of service, and the holy garments for Aaron the priest, and the garments of his sons, to minister in the priest's office,

11 <sup>o</sup> And the anointing oil, and <sup>p</sup>sweet incense for the holy *place*; according to all that I have commanded thee shall they do.

12 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

13 Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, <sup>q</sup>Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that *ye* may know that I *am* the LORD that doth sanctify you.

<sup>m</sup> ch. 38. 8. <sup>n</sup> ch. 39. 1. 41. Numb. 4. 5, 6, &c. <sup>o</sup> ch. 30. 25, 31. & 37. 29. <sup>p</sup> ch. 30. 34. & 37. 29. <sup>q</sup> Lev. 19. 3, 30. & 26. 2. Ezek. 20. 12, 20. & 44. 24.

the names on the gems of the breastplate. We do not indeed read elsewhere expressly of there having been any 'carved work' about the Tabernacle, which has led Patrick to suppose that the term indicated merely the common work of carpenters and joiners. But we deem it altogether probable that there was some ornamental carved work about the pillars; and if, as we have hinted above, several of the utensils were made from *moulds*, there can be little doubt that these were carved out of wood.—¶ *The furniture*. Heb. כֵּלִי *keli*, *vessels, implements, utensils*. See Note on Gen. 24. 53.—¶ *Clothes of service*. That is, the various vails and coverings of cloth which were used for wrapping the holy things whenever the people broke up from their encampments, and moved on their journeys. Comp. Numb. 4. 5—12.

*The Observance of the Sabbath re-enjoined.*

13. *Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep.*

14 \*Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore: for it *is* holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for <sup>s</sup>who-soever doeth *any* work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people.

15 †Six days may work be done,

<sup>r</sup> ch. 20. 8. Deut. 5. 12. Ezek. 20. 12. <sup>s</sup> ch. 35. 2. Numb. 15. 35. <sup>t</sup> ch. 20. 9.

This command is here repeated from the divine foresight of its necessity under the circumstances. It is as if he had said, 'You are indeed about to be employed in an important and sacred work, one requiring great assiduity and despatch; nevertheless let it not be thought that this circumstance affords sufficient ground for encroaching upon holy time with the work in which you are engaged. Let the most urgent business come to a pause during the hallowed hours of the Sabbath.'—  
¶ *The Lord that doth sanctify you.* That is, by an external consecration of the race of Israel to himself, as a sign and token of which the Sabbath was ordained as a day of worship and of rest from secular labor. The institution of the weekly Sabbath as a *sanctified* season, was an expressive indication of the character of the covenant relation which was to subsist between God and Israel. They were continually reminded by it that they were to be a *sanctified* people, chosen, separated, and distinguished from the rest of the world, with whom all traces of the primitive Sabbath had become nearly extinct. Consequently this institution would not be a sign to the Israelites only, but to the surrounding nations. They would be taught the same truth by the same medium. As the religious rites and ceremonies of all people are an index of the character of the deities whom they serve, so the stated observance of the Sabbath in a holy manner

but in the <sup>u</sup>seventh *is* the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth *any* work in the sabbath-day he shall surely be put to death.

16 Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, *for* a perpetual covenant.

<sup>u</sup> Gen. 2. 2. ch. 16. 23. & 20. 10.

would testify to all the world the holy attributes of that God whom they worshipped and with whom they were in covenant.

14. *It is holy unto you.* Heb. קדש לכם *kodesh hi lakem, it is holiness or sanctification unto you.*—  
¶ *Shall surely be put to death.* Heb. מות יומת *moth yumath, dying shall be made to die.* That is, by the hands of the magistrate if the iniquity could be proved; if not, by premature death at the hand of God himself, which seems, from the Rabbinical writers, to have been understood as the penalty denounced against daring crimes when there were no human witnesses to bear testimony to the fact. See Note on Gen. 17. 14.

15. *Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord.* Heb. שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה *shabbath shabbathon kodesh laihova, a sabbath of sabbatism, holiness to Jehovah.* Gr. ἀναπαυσις ἁγία τοῦ κυρίου, *a rest holy to the Lord.* The phrase is peculiarly intensive in the original. Upon comparing this with the preceding verse, it is clear that the two parties, God and Israel, were each to hold the Sabbath holy to the other; and upon this ground the observance of it is called v. 16, a 'perpetual covenant.'

16. *To observe the sabbath.* Heb. לעשות את השבת *la'isoeth eth hash-shabbath, lit. to do or make the sabbath.* The expression in the original is peculiar, and conveying an idea not easily transferable into English. Our phrases 'keep



17 It is \* a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for *in* six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.

18 ¶ And he gave unto Moses,

\* ver. 13. Ezek. 20. 12, 20. *γ* Gen. 1. 31. & 2. 2.

the Sabbath' and 'observe the Sabbath' are hardly to be distinguished in import from each other, carrying with them mainly the idea of *cessation from secular work*. But the Hebrew formulary 'to do the Sabbath' has the additional involved sense of the *active doing* or *performing* of certain acts and exercises essential to the due sanctification of a day which was yet emphatically a *day of rest*. The same phrase occurs Deut. 5. 15, 'And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to *keep the sabbath-day*. (לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת יוֹם שַׁבָּת, *to do the day of rest*).' So also, Deut. 16. 1, 'Observe the month of Abib, and *keep the passover* (עֲשֵׂת פֶּסַח *asitha pesah, do the passover*) unto the Lord thy God.' Comp. Mat. 26. 18, 'The Master saith, My time is at hand; *I will keep the passover* (ἐγὼ ποίησω τὸ πάσχα *I will do or make the passover*) at thy house with my disciples.' Again Deut. 16. 13, 'Thou shalt *observe the feast of tabernacles* (חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה *hag has-sukkoth ta'aseh, the feast of tabernacles thou shalt do or make*) seven days,' &c.

17. A sign between me and the children of Israel for ever. Chal. 'Between my Word and the sons of Israel.'—¶ Was refreshed. Heb. יִנְשָׁף *yinnaphesh, fetched breath*. Of course to be understood as spoken of God after the manner of men, on the principle of *anthropomorphism*, of which a very expanded detail is given in Rev. J. P.

when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, <sup>z</sup> two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.

<sup>z</sup> ch. 24. 12. & 32. 15, 16. & 34. 28, 29 Deut. 4. 13. & 5. 22. & 9. 10, 11. 2 Cor 3. 3.

Smith's Comparative View of Scripture and Geology.

### *The Delivery of the Tables of the Law.*

18. When he had made an end of communing with him. At the close of the forty days' sojourn upon the mount, during which time all the preceding laws and ordinances had been delivered to him. The clause occurs at a point where it forms a very suitable transition in the progress of the narrative. In the ensuing chapter he is about to relate the fact of his having broken the tables under the impulse of a holy indignation at the sins of the people, and he accordingly here premises the necessary information respecting the tables themselves, what they contained, and whence they were received.—¶ Two tables of testimony. The grounds of this appellation have already been explained, ch. 25. 16. The laws written on them testified the will of God as to the duties of his creatures, and by being received and deposited in the Ark, they were a *testimony* on the part of Israel that they had covenanted to receive and obey them upon the penalty of incurring all the judgments and curses by which they were enforced. They were written on tables of stone to denote their perpetual and unchangeable obligation; and they were written not by the *commandment*, but by the immediate *power* of God himself, here termed his 'finger,' which is elsewhere used in the same sense, Ps. 8. 3. Luke, 11. 20. As however, the 'finger of God' is spoken of by our Savior as equivalent to the 'Spirit of

God,' the power by which devils were cast out, some have supposed that all that is meant here is, that these tables were written by Moses indeed, but still by the direct *prompting* and *dictation* of the Spirit of God, so that it was more entitled to be considered as a divine than a human work. But the following passages would seem to be too explicit to allow of any other than the common explication. Ex. 24. 12, 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give the tables of stone, and a law, and commandments *which I have written*; that thou mayest teach them.' Ex. 32. 15, 16, 'And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand: the tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables *were the work of God*, and the writing *was the writing of God*, graven upon the tables.' Deut. 5. 22, 'These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness with a great voice; and he added no more: and *he wrote them in two tables of stone*, and delivered them unto me.' 'Of the Decalogue, above all other holy writ, God seems to say, as Paul, Philem. 19, 'Behold, I have written it with mine own hand.'" *Trapp.*

## CHAPTER XXXII.

### *The Golden Calf.*

If ever a situation occurred in the history of man in which we were authorised to expect the presence and prevalence of a deep and awful sense of the majesty of Jehovah, together with a grateful acknowledgment of his goodness, and a trembling solicitude to avoid every thing which might offend him, it was that in which the race of Israel was now placed at the base of the hallowed mount. They had ex-

perienced the most incontestible and astonishing proofs the divine power, favor, and love. Little more than thirty days had passed since they had witnessed a scene of grandeur and glory such as had never before been accorded to mortal eyes. Jehovah had delivered to them his holy law in the midst of thunder, lightning, earthquake, fire, and the presence of the ministering angels. The terms of a sacred binding covenant had been proposed to them, to which they with one voice acceded, and indeed the last thing which is related of them prior to the present chapter is, that 'Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said we will do, and be obedient.' Even now Moses was gone up into the mount to commune with God on their behalf; as their faithful representative, he had transacted all their great concerns; the forty days were almost completed; and he was just upon the point of coming down, bearing the sacred tables in his hand, and fully instructed and authorised to set up the Tabernacle-worship among them; when lo, the innate depravity of the human heart breaks out with a virulence utterly astounding, and unbelieving impatience ripens at once into an act of gross idolatry! Who could have thought it? Daily fed by manna from heaven; daily refreshed by water from the smitten rock; surrounded by miracles of might and benignity against which it would seem impossible that their eyes should be closed, who could have anticipated, that in utter defiance of the commandment to which they had so lately and so solemnly avowed obedience, they should have ordered the fabrication of other gods, and 'changed their glory into the likeness of an ox, that eateth grass?' Yet this is the mournful scene which we are now called to contem-

## CHAPTER XXXII.

AND when the people saw that Moses <sup>a</sup> delayed to come down out of the mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, <sup>b</sup> Up, make us

<sup>a</sup> ch. 24. 18. Deut. 9. 9. <sup>b</sup> Acts 7. 40.

plate! No wonder that Josephus should have felt this transaction to be such a stain on the character of his people as to make him ashamed to record it; although its disgracefulness cannot justify him, as an honest historian, in omitting it.

1. *When the people saw that Moses delayed, &c.* Heb. כִּי בִשְׁשׁ מִשָּׁה *ki boshesh Mosheh*, lit. *that Moses caused shame*. The idiom of the original in regard to this word is peculiar. The radical בֹּשַׁשׁ *bosh* signifies primarily *to be ashamed, abashed, to blush for shame*, whether through fear, modesty, or disappointment; and as long tarrying or waiting in vain for one's coming is apt to be attended with a sensation of shame or displacency, as Judg. 3. 25, 'they tarried till they were *ashamed*,' the word is thence easily applied as here to *tarrying or delaying*, the effect being put, by a usual rhetorical figure, for the cause. See this ideal connexion between *delay* and *shame* in the diction of the Hebrew more fully unfolded in the Note on Judg. 3. 25. The Gr. has *κεχρονικε* from *κρονιζω*, *to procrastinate*, a derivative from *κρονος*, usually rendered *time*, but in many cases more legitimately signifying *delay*. Thus Rev. 10. 5—7, 'And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth, lifted up his hand to heaven, And swore by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that *there should be time* (*κρονος delay*) *no longer*:' But in the days of the voice of the seventh

gods which shall <sup>c</sup> go before us: for *as for* this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.

<sup>c</sup> ch. 13. 21.

angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets, Here the meaning undoubtedly is, that there should be *no longer delay than until* the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when the events predicted should come to pass. As there can be no question, from the computation of prophetic chronology, that we are brought, in the evolutions of providence, to the very borders of this period, it should be no matter of surprise to witness the most stupendous changes, moral, intellectual, and political in the affairs of the world. The 'finishing of the mystery of God' is a much greater event, or order of events, than the occurrence of the anticipated Millennium.

—¶ *Gathered themselves together unto Aaron.* Heb. יִקְהֵל עַל אַהֲרֹן *yik-kahël al Aaron*, *were assembled upon or against, Aaron*. The usual term in Hebrew for *to is* אֵל *el* instead of עַל *al*, which latter has more the sense of *contra, against*, and the idea intended to be conveyed is probably that they *beset* him in a violent and tumultuous manner, clamorously demanding of him that he should yield to their wishes. It is perhaps but justice to Aaron to suppose that he at first earnestly opposed the measure, but that he was at length overcome by the importunity and menaces of the people. Still nothing can excuse his ultimate compliance.—

¶ *Up, make us gods, &c.* Heb. עֲשֵׂה לָנוּ אֱלֹהִים *as'eh lanu elohim*, *make for us Elohîm*. The term itself leaves it somewhat doubtful whether a unity or plurality of idea is intended by it, as it

admits of either. From Neh. 9. 18, it would seem that the former was the meaning; 'Yea, when they had made them a molten calf, and said, *This is thy God* that brought thee out of Egypt.' The same is doubtless also to be inferred from the fact that Aaron made only one calf. Stephen indeed, Acts, 7. 40, uses the plural number, but this is probably merely in imitation of the Hebrew form, which very often has a singular import. Comp. Gen. 25. 13. 35. 7. We are not to suppose that a people who only six weeks before had witnessed such amazing demonstrations of the existence and glory of the true God had suddenly sunk to such a pitch of mad infatuation and brutish stupidity, as to imagine that human fabrication could 'make a god that should go before them.' Their meaning was that an image, a visible sign or symbol of Jehovah, should be made, something which should answer to them in place of the Shekinah which had hitherto conducted them in the pillar of cloud. This visible symbol, which they had hitherto enjoyed, and which had now become apparently immovable on the summit of the mount, is frequently denominated 'glory,' or 'glory of the Lord,' and as they proposed to form to themselves so vile a substitute for this as a brute animal, therefore it is that the Psalmist calls it a 'changing of their *glory* into the likeness of an ox that eateth grass.' That the measure was prompted at bottom by a disrelish of a purely spiritual worship, and a desire to be furnished with some *sensible sign* of a divine presence in the midst of them, is, we think, quite manifest; and that the forms of Egyptian idolatry, to which they had been previously familiarised, had tended to infuse this leaven into their minds, is, in our view, equally unquestionable. We are inclined, therefore, to give no little weight to the following extracts from the Rabbinical writers cited by Bishop

Patrick. In the Pirke Elieser (c. 55.) we are told that 'they said unto Aaron, The Egyptians extol their gods; they sing and chant before them; for they behold them with their eyes. Make us such gods as theirs are, that we may see them before us.' So also R. Jehudah (Cosri, P. 1. § 97.) 'They desired a sensible object of divine worship to be set before them; not with an intention to deny God, who brought them out of Egypt, but that something in the place of God might stand before them, when they declared his wonderful works.' —¶ *We wot not what is become of him.* They evidently had no sufficient reason to warrant them in supposing that he was lost, or that he delayed his return longer than was necessary. They knew that he had made arrangements for a somewhat protracted stay. They had seen him ascend the mount and enter the cloud; they knew his errand, for they had themselves, when shrinking under a sense of guilt and terror from converse with the Most High, delegated him to be their representative. Had they not then every reason to be persuaded of his safety? Yet they *affect* to consider him as lost to them, as no more to come among them; nor any more to guide them towards the promised land! Yet even if they were sincere in this, how little respect do they show to his memory! How lightly do they speak of the apparent loss of their faithful leader, of their kind benefactor! 'We wot not what is become of him!'—evidently implying that they *cared* as little as they pretended to *know*. Alas! how true is it, as evinced by this transaction, that the highest services, the greatest merits, the richest benefactions, cannot secure their subjects from the vilest indignities, aspersions, and ingratitude of their objects!

2. *Aaron said unto them, break off the golden ear-rings, &c.* The very jewels, without doubt, of which they

2 And Aaron said unto them, Break off the <sup>d</sup>golden ear-rings which *are* in the ears of your wives, of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring *them* unto me.

3 And all the people brake off the golden ear-rings which *were* in their ears, and brought *them* unto Aaron.

<sup>d</sup> Judg. 8. 24, 25, 26, 27.

had despoiled their oppressors at their departure from Egypt, and at the Red Sea. But what shall be said of the conduct of Aaron on this emergency? We have no intimation in the text that he remonstrated at all against the monstrous suggestion, or endeavored in the least to convince the people of their sin and folly in the measure they proposed; and yet we would fain, if possible, find some extenuation of the course pursued by so good a man on this occasion. There is perhaps a shadow of ground, on which to erect a charitable apology for Aaron in this part of the transaction. The proposal that they should break off and give up their ear-rings *may* have been made in the secret hope, that they would be unwilling to devote their choicest treasures to this object, and that while they were wavering in reference to the project, Moses might return and by his presence crush the growing evil in the bud. But the result showed that it is not safe to try experiments upon the readiness of sinners to make sacrifices for their lusts, and that his true course was at once to have stood up and boldly resisted their insolent and impious demands, even at the hazard of his life. His not taking this resolute stand, and in humble trust in God braving all consequences, but pusillanimously yielding to their importunities, gave a kind of *public* and *official* sanction to the whole proceeding, in consequence of which the people would naturally rush on with ten-

4 <sup>e</sup> And he received *them* at their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf: and they said, These *be* thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.

<sup>e</sup> ch. 20. 23. Deut. 9. 16. Judg. 17. 3, 4. 1 Kings 12. 28. Neh. 9. 18. Ps. 106. 19. Isai. 46. 6. Acts 7. 41. Rom. 1. 23.

fold violence in their chosen way. How fearful the example of a great and good man succumbing to the urgency of a lawless mob! How deplorable the issues when the appointed *barriers* to iniquity become, by their yielding, its *abettors*!

3. *All the people brake off*, &c. The sequel shows that the phrase 'all the people' is not to be taken in its most literal sense, for there were some that still refused to give in to the general act of rebellion; but the majority were unanimous, and promptly resigned their ornaments; thus teaching us that the impulse of a mad and foolish superstition is sometimes sufficiently powerful to overrule the principles of pride and avarice, and that the charges of idolatry are more cheerfully met than the expenses of the true religion. Alas! how is the niggardliness of the people of God in maintaining the services of his worship rebuked by the liberality and self-sacrifices of the votaries of idols!

4. *Fashioned it with a graving-tool*, after, &c. But if it were run or cast in a mould, as is implied by the word 'molten,' how could it properly be said to have been *fashioned* afterward? The literal rendering of the original is, 'He fashioned it with a graving-tool, and made it a calf of molten-work;' by which we may understand either, that he first formed a model of wood, with the instrument here mentioned, by means of which a mould was construct-

5 And when Aaron saw *it*, he built an altar before it; and Aaron

made <sup>f</sup>proclamation, and said, To-morrow is a feast to the LORD.

<sup>f</sup> Lev. 23. 2, 4, 21, 37. 2 Kings 10. 20. Chron. 30. 5.

ed, and in the mould the calf was cast, or that the carved image was itself made into the idol by having the melted metal poured over it. It is a point difficult to be determined, and one that has given rise to much diversity of interpretation among commentators. This we forbear to recite, as it is needless to swell the accumulation of uncertainties. — ¶ *Made it a molten calf.* The motive for giving this form to a representation of the Deity, is doubtless to be proximately traced to their familiarity with the idol worship of Egypt. That people were in the habit of paying divine honors to Apis in the form of an ox or bull, and this probably offered the hint to the Israelites on the present occasion. Whether Apis was in himself an original and independent God, or merely a living and visible representation of another, is still questionable. The most general and probable opinion is, that he was regarded as a symbol of their chief god Osiris, or the Sun; and if so, we can see more reason for the remark made above, that the object of the Israelites in this proceeding was to make a *symbol* or *sign* of the Most High, or something to represent to the senses his real presence among them. But although the allusion to the Egyptian mythology now recognised might, without going any farther, be deemed a sufficient explanation of the fact, we are still induced to express the opinion that there was, moreover, at the same time a latent and ultimate reference to the cherubic symbol, of which the ox was one of the leading elements. We know no reason to doubt that from the earliest ages the Cherubim, as an accompaniment of the Shekinah, had been revealed under the fourfold variety of aspect which is as-

signed to them in Ezekiel; and as this device was consequently closely connected in the Israelitish mind with the visible manifestation of the Deity, it would not be unnatural that, having come recently from Egypt, they should have chosen it as the most appropriate medium of representing Jehovah. — ¶ *These be thy gods, O Israel, &c* That is, this is thy god, O Israel; in accordance with what we have already said above of the import of the phrase. The tenor of the observations just made must be our clue to the right construction of this language. Aaron did not intend to say that this molten image was the *real* and *veritable* God who had brought them out of Egypt, but simply that it was his visible symbol; and not improbably his secret hope was, that on this account they would make the due mental discrimination, and not be so sottish as to worship it. But the act was in direct contravention of the second commandment, and that it was regarded by the Spirit of God as an instance of downright, unequivocal idolatry, we are assured upon the testimony of the apostle, 1 Cor. 10. 7, 'Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them.' So also Ps. 106. 19, 'They made a calf in Horeb and worshipped the molten image.' 'How oft, alas! have we abused God's mercy; taking his jewels, and making a golden calf of them!' *Trapp.*

5. *When Aaron saw it, &c.* Heb. *וַיַּרְא אֶת־הַכֶּלֶב* *ra-yar Aaron, and Aaron saw*; i. e. saw the result; saw how the affair was regarded by the people; saw and considered the issue of his own conduct. The word '*it*,' supplied by our translators, does not refer to the calf, but in a wider sense to what occurred upon its formation. — ¶ *And*

6 And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings: and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.

7 ¶ And the LORD said unto Mo-

se 1 Cor. 10. 7.

*Aaron made a proclamation, and said, To-morrow is a feast to the Lord.* Heb. לַיהוָה הַגְּ לַיְהוָה *hag laihovah, a feast to, for, or of Jehovah.* By Aaron's building an altar and proclaiming this feast to the true God, it would seem that he still proposed within himself to lead the thoughts of the people through the outward medium and fix them upon Jehovah himself, the only proper object of adoration. But such a mixture of *divine* and *idolatrous* worship never fails to mislead the mass of men, and though the *priests* of a corrupt religion, in imitation of Aaron, may plead that the use of paintings, images, and sacrifices, is intended merely as a help, by sensible media, to spiritual worship, yet there can be no doubt that its practical effects are always just the same with those here recorded, and that it comes under the same condemnation. Whatever were Aaron's private views or wishes, the transaction is thus again characterised by the Holy Ghost, Acts, 7. 41, 'And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifices unto the idol, and rejoiced in the work of their hands.' So Jehu, led away by the same delusion, could boast of his zeal for the Lord of hosts, while yet he was a worshipper of the golden calves of Jeroboam, 2 Kings, 10. 16, 29.

6. And they rose up early, &c. Eagerly intent upon their idolatrous service, and apparently uneasy at its being delayed so long as until the morrow, they lost no time on the ensuing morning in bringing their burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, although of *sin-offerings*, which they most needed, *they* find no mention. They thought-

ses, <sup>h</sup>Go, get thee down: for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, <sup>i</sup>have corrupted themselves:

<sup>h</sup> Deut. 9. 12, ver. 1. ch. 33. 1. Dan. 9. 24. <sup>i</sup> Gen. 6. 11, 12. Deut. 4. 16. & 32. 5. Judg. 2. 19. Hos. 9. 9.

lessly exulted in the celebration of a festival which was soon to prove so fatal to them.—¶ *Sat down to eat and to drink.* That is, upon the remainder of the oblation of peace-offerings, to a share of which the offerers were entitled. The burnt-offerings were wholly consumed as holocausts. By thus partaking of these offerings they were brought into forbidden fellowship with the idol, as is clear from the reasonings of Paul, 1 Cor. 10. 17—21. The sad consequences of this apostasy they were soon made to experience. God's jealousy burns very fiercely about his altar.—¶ *Rose up to play.* Heb. לְצַחֵק *letzahëk.* A word of ominous import, implying not only such sports as singing, dancing, and merry-making in general, but in some cases also a species of conduct which the epithet *uanton* as correctly defines as any term which we deem it proper to employ. Compare the use of the same original word, rendered 'mock,' Gen. 39. 14. Compare also Num. 25. 1, 2. In like manner it appears that the ancient sacrificial feasts among the Gentiles were so frequently turned into scenes of voluptuous revelling and drunkenness, that Athenæus informs us, that by the early Greeks, the word μεθεῖν, *to be drunk*, was supposed to be derived from μετα το θυεῖν, *after the sacrifices*, when they gave themselves up to large drinking.

7. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down, &c. As if the urgency of the occasion would naturally give the utmost intensity to the language, the Greek here adds the word 'quickly,' as does Moses indeed himself in speaking of the incident, Deut.

8 They have turned aside quickly out of the way which <sup>k</sup>I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, <sup>l</sup>These *be* thy

<sup>k</sup> ch. 20. 3, 4, 23. Deut. 9. 16. <sup>l</sup> 1 Kings 2. 28.

9. 12, 'Arise, get thee down quickly.' The people, abandoning themselves to unhallowed revelry, thought neither of God, before whom they had so recently trembled, nor of Moses, their venerable leader and friend, nor of the ten commandments to which they had a few weeks since so solemnly sworn obedience, and one of which in the most express terms forbade the very crime of which they were now guilty. Giving themselves up to licentious mirth, they thought only of the present moment. But here we learn how the matter was viewed *on the mount*. This ought in fact to have been their chief concern—not how *they* regarded it, but how it was looked upon *from above*. But this was neglected, and the same neglect is continually evinced by heedless transgressors intent upon sensual pleasures. Ah, did they but reflect that there is an sleeping eye ever watchful over their career, and a true estimate incessantly making up of their conduct, which will finally come to them in the form of a fearful indictment, what a salutary damper would it throw upon their profane hilarities! How needful is it for us often while sporting *on the plain*, to think of the judgment formed of our conduct *on the mount*!—¶ *Thy people*. A tone of indignation breathes through this language, as if the offending people had forfeited all right to be longer considered *God's* people, and he had utterly cast them off; 'for *thy* people have corrupted themselves.' The effect of sin is to write 'Lo-ammi,' *not my people*, upon the most chosen servants of Jehovah. 'But in this mode of

gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.

9 And the LORD said unto Moses, <sup>m</sup>I have seen this people, and behold, it is a stiff-necked people:

<sup>m</sup> ch. 33. 3, 5. & 34. 9. Deut. 9. 6. 13. & 31. 27. 2 Chron. 30. 8. Isai. 48. 4. Acts 7. 51.

speech something gracious was concealed. A hint was, as it were, given him to gainsay the Lord, and to put him upon the *thine* and the *thou*. Of this he immediately availed himself and said, 'Why doth thy wrath wax hot against *thy* people, which *thou* hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt, with great power, and with a mighty hand?' *Krummacher*. The original term for 'corrupted' implies both their *idolatry* and the *consequent judgments* which they had brought upon themselves, according to the twofold sense of the same word, Gen. 6. 11—13, on which see Note.

8. *They have turned aside quickly*, &c. This language might properly be used considering the very short time that had passed since they heard the law from mount Sinai, and promised obedience, and were afterwards warned not to 'make to them gods of silver or of gold.' They *quickly* forgot his works; but the punishment which their sudden defection incurred admonishes us, that nothing is more provoking in the eyes of heaven than a speedy backsliding after solemnly renewing our covenant with God, or receiving special mercies at his hand.

9. *I have seen this people*, &c. Targ Jon. 'The pride of this people is revealed before me.' The meaning is, I have long noted, observed, and studied, as it were, their disposition. I know their genius, and the character which I am constrained to give of them is, that they are a stiff-necked people. This is a metaphor taken from stubborn and intractable bullocks whose necks are



10 Now therefore <sup>n</sup> let me alone, that <sup>o</sup> my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them: and <sup>p</sup> I will make of thee a great nation.

11 <sup>q</sup> And Moses besought the LORD his God, and said, LORD, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land

<sup>n</sup> Deut. 9. 14, 19. <sup>o</sup> ch. 22. 24. <sup>p</sup> Numb. 14. 12. <sup>q</sup> Deut. 9. 18, 26, 27, 28, 29. Ps. 74. 1, 2. & 106. 23.

brought with the greatest difficulty to submit to the yoke. Compare the equivalent allusion, Is. 48. 4, 'Thy neck is an iron sinew,' which would not bend. Jer. 5. 5, 'But these (the great men) have altogether broken the yoke and burst the bonds.'

10. *Now therefore let me alone, &c.* Chal. 'Leave off thy prayer before me.' Do not interpose by prayers and deprecations in their behalf. Moses had not yet opened his mouth, but God foresaw the holy violence with which his importunity would besiege his throne, and *apparently* desires him not to intercede for them. What greater or more significant proof could be given of the divine condescension to the petitions of a mortal? 'God is fain to bespeak his own freedom; as if Moses' devotion were stronger than God's indignation. Great is the power of prayer; able, after a sort, to transfuse a dead palsy into the hand of Omnipotence.' *Trapp*. The words, however, which *seemed* to forbid, were *really* intended to encourage Moses in his suit. They are not indeed a positive command to him to pray in behalf of Israel, but they indicated what it was that would stay the divine hand from punishing; and were equivalent to saying, 'If you intercede for them, my hands are tied, and I cannot execute the deserved vengeance.' Of this hint Moses would not be slow to avail himself.—<sup>π</sup> *And I will make of thee a great nation. As*

of Egypt, with great power, and with a mighty hand?

12 <sup>r</sup> Wherefore should the Egyptians speak and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and <sup>s</sup> repent of this evil against thy people.

<sup>r</sup> Numb. 14. 13. Deut. 9. 28. & 32. 27 <sup>s</sup> ver. 14.

if the Most High would bribe the forbearance of his servant. The words evidently disclose a secret purpose to try the spirit of Moses, as if to see whether the prospect of becoming great and distinguished himself, would outweigh his regard for the interests of his people. He assaults him in a point where most men are most vulnerable, but the noble disinterestedness of Moses was proof against the power of this appeal to the selfish principles of his nature, and the apparent dissuasives from intercession only urged him on with more vehemence in his suit.

11. *Why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, &c.* This is not probably to be understood as an expostulation, as if there were not sufficient cause for God to be angry; but rather as an earnest entreaty that he would not in wrath consume them. The same usage of speech is common both in the prophets and the Psalms. Thus Ps. 44. 23, 24, 'Awake, *why* sleepest thou, O Lord? arise, cast us not off for ever. *Wherefore* hidest thou thy face, and forgettest our affliction and our oppression?' See also the interrogative and optative modes of expression interchanged, Mat. 5. 39, and Luke. 8. 52. Mat. 8. 29, and Luke, 8. 28.

12. *Wherefore should the Egyptians speak and say, &c.* The prayer of Moses on this occasion contains a three-fold plea; (1.) That God would not reflect upon his own wisdom by *so soon*

13 Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou 'swarest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, "I will multiply your seed as the stars of hea-

<sup>1</sup> Gen. 22. 16. Hebr. 6. 13. <sup>u</sup> Gen. 12. 7. & 13. 15. & 15. 7. 18. & 26. 4. & 28. 13. & 35. 1, 12.

destroying what he had employed so much power to preserve. (2.) That he would not give advantage to the Egyptians to glory over the ruin of a race whom they so much hated. (3.) That he would remember his covenant promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The second of these arguments he prosecutes in the passage before us, and in doing so shows that he had the glory of God quite as much at heart as the welfare of Israel. Aware that the eyes and the tongues of Egypt and the surrounding nations were intent on finding matter of malicious triumph over a people so signally delivered from bondage, so miraculously sustained, so wonderfully conducted, he would at all hazards preclude every ground and occasion upon which the divine glory could be blemished in the estimate of his enemies. Should the chosen people now after such illustrious displays of divine power in their behalf perish under the stroke of deserved wrath, what would be more natural than that fickleness or impotence should be imputed to their covenant God, and thus his holy name be blasphemed on every side? All that had been thus far done would go for nothing, and to human appearance the Most High would 'disgrace the throne of his glory.' But this was a consequence which the pious heart of Moses could not endure to contemplate, and therefore is he so emphatic in urging the question, 'What will the Egyptians say?' Whatever petitions we offer to God, the glorifying his great name should ever be the grand prompting motive and the ultimate scope.—

For mischief. Heb. ברעה *beraah*,

ven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever.

14 And the LORD <sup>w</sup>repented of

<sup>w</sup> Deut. 32. 26. 2 Sam. 24. 16. 1 Chron. 21. 15. Ps. 106. 45. Jer. 18. 8. & 26. 13, 19 Joel 2. 13. Jonah 3. 10. & 4. 2.

in evil, in malice; i. e. maliciously. Gr. μετα πονηρίας, *with maliciousness* — <sup>π</sup> Repent of this evil against thy people. Heb. על הרעה לעמך *al haraah le-ammeka*, over the evil to thy people. Gr. επι τη κακια του λαου σου, *upon the evil of the people*. The original doubtless implies both the evil of crime committed by the people, and the evil of punishment suffered, or about to be suffered, by them. The latter idea of the two was so prominent in the mind of the Chaldean translator that he has rendered it, 'Repent of the evil which thou purposedst to do unto thy people.' This of course is spoken after the manner of men on the principles explained in the Note on Gen. 6. 6. The simple meaning is, 'Relent from inflicting this threatened evil.'

13. Remember Abraham, Isaac, &c. This was doubtless the great argument of all, the promise made to the fathers. To the fulfilment of this promise the veracity of God would have been pledged, had it been given simply in the form of a plain declaration; but there was more than this; it was a promise confirmed by an oath, and an oath sworn by himself, than whom he could swear by no greater. Consequently nothing could be conceived more binding by which the honor of divine truth could be engaged to the performance of its stipulations. It is as if he had said, 'Lord, if thy people be now destroyed, shall not thy promise fail for evermore? And shall their unbelief be allowed to make thy truth of none effect? God forbid.'

14. And the Lord repented, &c. Heb. וינחם ייחיהם *va-yinnahem Yehovah*. Gr.

the evil which he thought to do unto his people.

15 ¶ And \* Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand: the tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written.

\* Deut. 9. 15.

ἰλασθῆ κυριος, the Lord was propitiated; the same term which occurs in the prayer of the publican, Luke, 18. 13, 'God, be merciful (ἰλασθητι, be propitiated) to me a sinner;' i. e. by the intervention of a mediator. The publican therefore does not rely upon the absolute mercy of God irrespective of an atonement.—The suit of Moses prevails with Jehovah. He so redoubles and multiplies the obstacles which he would fain throw in the way of the execution of vengeance, that God virtually acknowledges himself overcome, and accordingly the Psalmist says, Ps. 106. 23, 'He would have destroyed them had not Moses his chosen stood before him in the breach.'

15. The two tables of testimony were in his hand. The reason of this denomination has been previously explained. See Note on Ex. 25. 16. These tables, as we are elsewhere informed, were of stone; by which we are perhaps to understand a substance similar to that of the precious stones; beautiful and splendid in a high degree, as well as durable, that it might correspond with the remaining articles of the tabernacle-furniture. Thus the Jewish writers; 'The first tables were hewn out of the sapphire of the throne of God's glory.' The two tables were probably designed to close together like the lids of a book, and by their being written on both sides is meant that their right and left hand leaf or side were each of them to be occupied with letters.

VOL. II.

19

16 And the y tables were the work of God and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables.

17 And when Joshua heard the noise of the people as they shouted, he said unto Moses, *There is a noise of war in the camp.*

y ch. 31. 18.

16. The tables were the work of God, &c. That is, the preparation of the materials, the stony tablets, by which they were brought into a state suitable for receiving the purposed inscription, was as purely the work of Jehovah himself, as the engraving of the characters which appeared upon them.

17. And when Joshua heard, &c. The ignorance of Joshua respecting the real nature of the uproar in the camp evinces that he had not, after ascending the mount with Moses, ch. 24. 13, as yet returned thither again; so that the inference is obvious that Joshua, as well as Moses, was forty days in the mount, though not in the same part of it. How he was sustained or employed we are not informed. He was now probably waiting for Moses at some distance from the top of the mountain, at the point whither Moses 'went down,' v. 15, and upon his re-appearance addressed him in the words that follow. His calm and quiet waiting during all the time of Moses' absence stands in very strong and, to him, creditable contrast with the rash, impatient, and unbelieving temper of the people during the same period.—¶ As they shouted. Targ. Jon., 'When they shouted with the noise of jubilee before the calf.'—¶ A noise of war in the camp. Heb. קול מלחמה kol milhamah; a phrase rendered in Jer. 50. 22, 'the sound of battle.' The sounds that struck his ear were so different from those with which the camp had thus far been familiar, that he seems at once

18 And he said, *It is not the voice of them that shout for mastery, neither is it the voice of them that cry for being overcome: but the noise of them that sing do I hear.*

19 ¶ And it came to pass as soon

to have concluded that an attack had been made upon the host by some of the wandering tribes of the desert, and that what he heard was the cry or shout of onset, such as was usually made by an eager soldiery rushing into combat. But this erroneous report of his senses was soon corrected.

18. *It is not the voice, &c.* Heb. 'It is no voice of the crying of strength (prowess), and it is no voice of the crying of weakness.' Chal. 'It is not the voice of strong men which overcome in the war, neither is it the voice of weak men which are discomfited'—a correct paraphrase.—¶ *But the noise of them that sing do I hear.* That sing in alternate or responsive strains, one choir answering (עֲנִיתָ *annoth*) another, as the original properly implies. Gr. 'The voice of them that sing for wine;' in allusion to their revelling and riot. As Moses had been instructed of God as to what the people were now doing, he could easily correct the mistaken apprehensions of Joshua.

19. *And it came to pass, &c.* The first effects of this fearful apostacy are here related. They show themselves in the conduct of their returning leader. It is recorded as a high character of Moses that he was pre-eminent in meekness. Yet in his, as in every other case of true meekness, this spirit wrought in harmonious cooperation with a lively and glowing zeal for the Lord of hosts. With all his gentleness and patience he could tolerate nothing that reflected or cast a stain upon the divine glory. His own insults and injuries, the ingratitude and disrespect shown to himself during his absence, he could

as he came nigh unto the camp, that <sup>z</sup>he saw the calf, and the dancing: and Moses' anger waxed hot, and he cast the tables out of his hands, and break them beneath the mount.

<sup>z</sup> Deut. 9. 16, 17.

easily pass by. But not so the offence committed against God. This was too gross, daring, and high-handed an insult to the majesty of heaven not to draw from him the tokens of a holy indignation. Accordingly as he approached the camp and beheld the congregation giving themselves up to bacchanalian revelries and dancing around the idol which they had formed, he cast the precious tables out of his hand and brake them to pieces at his feet. This was not done in a paroxysm of intemperate wrath, but as a significant emblem representing the crime which they had now committed. He was undoubtedly inwardly moved to it by a prompting from above. God had condescended to enter into a covenant with them to be their God, and they had covenanted to be his people. These tables of stone contained, as it were, the terms of agreement; and were a pledge, that God would fulfil to them all that he had spoken. This covenant they had entirely annulled, and consequently all their expectations from God were utterly destroyed. Such a mode therefore of representing the transaction, on the part of Moses, was perfectly lawful and right. Indeed, so far was his conduct on this occasion from being a sudden transport or sally even of pious wrath in view of the enormity of Israel's sin, that there is every reason to regard it as the result of a deliberate purpose executed indeed by a roused and energetic spirit. It is to be recollected that he did not first come to the knowledge of the people's crime, when he first came within sight of the camp. God had previously informed him of it,

20 <sup>a</sup> And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt *it* in the fire, and ground *it* to powder, and

<sup>a</sup> Deut. 9. 21.

and it was no doubt under divine dictation that he resolved as he descended upon the manner in which he should most significantly express his own and Jehovah's sense of the fearful consequences of their guilt. This was to be done by some action performed in the sight of the host. Accordingly instead of being ordered to leave the tables behind him on the mount, he was directed to take them along with him, that when they were broken before their eyes they might be more deeply affected, and filled with confusion to think what blessings they had lost. They had broken the covenant itself, and Moses as a sensible sign of the awful fact breaks the monumental tables in which it was inscribed. Nothing could more solemnly indicate that their covenant standing was wrecked, and that they now lay exposed to the severest vengeance of an angry God. It is doubtless in this view of the transaction that we find no censure passed upon Moses, nor does he afterward, Deut. 9. 17, speak of it with any regret.

20. *And he took the calf, &c.* The zeal with which he was inspired enabled him to face the congregation with majestic authority, and to seize and reduce to powder the vile fabrication of their hands. They appear to have been too much overawed by his presence to attempt any resistance, and he proceeded at once in a very striking manner both to convince them of their sin, and to punish them for it. He gives them a demonstration of the vanity of the idol which they had so stupidly worshipped by virtually annihilating it, except as a portion of it remained as an instrument of correction.—*¶ Ground it to powder.* Heb. יִטָּח *yithan*. The original denotes any mode of com-

minuting or reducing to small particles a hard substance, whether by filing, grinding, or any other process of abrasion. As to the precise manner in which the effect was produced in the present instance, we are not informed. We must be left to our own conjectures, aided only by the dim light of the parallel passage, Deut. 9. 21, 'And I took your sin, the calf which ye had made, and burnt it with fire, and stamped it, and ground it very small, even until it was as small as dust: and I cast the dust thereof into the brook that descended out of the mount.' By its being 'stamped' we are probably to infer that it was *beat* or *hammered* out into thin plates, and from that form reduced to the condition of a fine dust, which might easily be strewed upon the water. The process would no doubt require considerable time and labor; but he would have numbers to assist him, and no hypothetical difficulties in the way of the result are to be allowed to countervail the express testimony of revelation that *such was the fact*.—

*¶ Made the children of Israel to drink of it.* Not perhaps that he *constrained* them to this; but having no other water for their daily use than that of the brook which descended out of the mount, Ex. 17. 6. Deut. 9. 21, they could not avoid, when they drank at all, drinking this mixture. How suitable the punishment to the sin! What greater indignity could be offered to the worthless idol? What more humiliating punishment could be inflicted upon the people, than to be thus compelled to *swallow their god*, and to 'cast him out into the draught' with their common food. But this, like the breaking the tables, was an *emblematical* action. It not only showed them how utterly con-

21 And Moses said unto Aaron,  
 b What did this people unto thee,  
 that thou hast brought so great a  
 sin upon them?

b Gen. 20. 9. & 26. 10.

temptible was the idol, which could thus be reduced so near to nothing, but taught them also in a most impressive manner, that 'the backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways.' The powder mixed with their drink 'signified to them that the curse they had thereby brought upon themselves, would mingle itself with all their enjoyments, and embitter them; that it would enter into their bowels like water, and like oil into their bones.' *Henry.*

21. *And Moses said unto Aaron, &c.* Another painful duty still remained to be performed by Moses. His own brother had been 'chief in the transgression,' and he is now to be called to account and interrogated with a holy sternness. The language in which Moses addressed him might seem at first view to involve a latent vein of irony or satire, as if he had inquired what offence they had committed against him, that he should think of avenging himself by leading them into so great wickedness. This would imply that so enormous in his eyes was the guilt of the transaction, that it must have required some *violent motive* on the part of Aaron to prompt him to engage in it. On the common principles by which a servant of God might be supposed to be actuated, it seemed to him impossible to account for his conduct, and he therefore asks if there were not some *personal* consideration which moved him to the deed. This is the view taken of the passage by Scott and other commentators, who understand Moses as insinuating that the spirit of *retaliation* or *revenge* was at the bottom of his conduct. But we prefer on the whole a simpler construction of the

22 And Aaron said, Let not the  
 anger of my lord wax hot: c thou  
 knowest the people, that they *are*  
 set on mischief.

c ch. 14. 11. & 15. 24. & 16. 2, 20, 28. & 17. 2. 4.

speaker's meaning. We believe the scope of the question is simply to inquire, what were the influences and inducements brought to bear upon him by the people, which could prevail to gain his consent to such an abominable measure. If it were possible for him to advance any thing which should stand him instead of an excuse, he was willing and anxious to hear it. 'Did they importune, or cajole, or threaten thee? Make a free confession, and solve the problem of thy conduct.' Yet it is not to be supposed that Moses anticipated any answer from Aaron that could *really* excuse him, or explain away the fact that a *great sin* had been actually committed. Whatever were his motives, *he had led the people into sin*, not perhaps by being the first mover of it, but by consenting to it, aiding and abetting it, when, as a magistrate, he should have resisted and put it down. He might justly be said, therefore, to have 'brought it upon them' by giving them his countenance in it. Such is the tenfold power of evil, which attaches itself to the example of those who stand high in authority and repute! In the estimate of Scripture Aaron's conduct was a virtual *hatred* of his people which was not to have been expected except from an *enemy*. Lev. 19. 17, 'Thou shalt not *hate* thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and shalt not *suffer sin upon him*.' This text is an humbling commentary upon the proceedings of Aaron in this sad affair.

22. *And Aaron said, Let not, &c.* The reasons assigned by Aaron for his conduct are honest, but frivolous. He makes a candid statement of the facts,

23 For they said unto me, <sup>d</sup>Make us gods which shall go before us: for *as for* this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.

24 And I said unto them, whosoever hath any gold, let them break

<sup>d</sup> ver. 1.

but leaves himself wholly unjustified in the premises, as may easily be inferred from the circumstance, that Moses does not seem to regard it as deserving of a reply. He passes by the lame apology without a single word of comment.—

¶ *Thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief.* Heb. בְּרַע הָרָא *bera hu*, that they *are in evil*; an emphatic mode of expression indicating that they are, as it were, settled, sunk, immersed in evil or in sin. So, 1 John, 5. 19, 'The whole world lieth in *wickedness* (in evil);' a phrase equivalent to *being very evil*, as when it is said, Ps. 33. 4, (Heb.) 'his words are *in truth*,' the meaning is, that his words are *pre-eminently true* and *faithful*. Gr. 'Thou knowest the violent force of this people.' Yet how obvious even to a child, that the perverseness of the people was no apology for the pusillanimity of their leader. Were they given to evil?—So much the more needful was it for him to stem the torrent, and by inflexible firmness withstand the workings of their corruptions. Our instinctive sentiments at once respond to the justice of the divine judgment respecting this affair as recorded, Deut. 9. 20, 'And the Lord was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him: and I prayed for Aaron also the same time.'

24. *And there came out this calf.* It might perhaps appear from the letter that Aaron intended to insinuate, that the calf was produced by accident, or by some invisible or magical operation, and that he was as much surprised at

it off. So they gave it me: then I cast it into the fire, and there <sup>e</sup>came out this calf.

25 ¶ And when Moses saw that the people *were* <sup>f</sup>naked, (for Aaron <sup>g</sup>had made them naked unto *their* shame among their enemies,)

<sup>e</sup> ver. 4. <sup>f</sup> ch. 33. 4, 5. <sup>g</sup> 2 Chron. 28. 19.

the result as any one else could be. The Targ. Jon. takes the same view of it; 'And I said unto them, whosoever hath gold let him break it off and give it to me; and I cast it into the fire, *and Satan entered into it*, and it came out in the form of this calf.' But it is scarcely possible to conceive that a man like Aaron should have resorted to such a silly and ridiculous subterfuge. We therefore take it as a brief and rather garbled account of the process of formation, upon the details of which he did not like to dwell, though he would not deny his agency in the affair. He confesses that he took the gold and melted it, and that the calf was the result; but he excuses himself from reciting all the particulars of the process.

25. *And when Moses saw that the people were naked.* Heb. פָּרַע *parua*, from פָּרַע *para*, to free, to set loose, to let break away, and thence to fall into disorder, confusion, and exposedness, a state in which one is *naked of defence*. This is probably the leading idea; not so much that they were denuded of their garments or ornaments, as that they were deprived by their impious act of the favorable presence and protection of heaven, which was their glory and their strength, so that they now stood as *naked unarmed men* liable to be surprised and put to flight by the weakest enemy. It was doubtless a conduct strikingly exemplifying the truth of the apothegm of one of the Latin fathers; 'Non est nudus nisi quem culpa nudaverit;' *he only is naked whom*

26 Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the LORD's side? let him come unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him.

27 And he said unto them, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Put

*crime hath made so.* As the import, however, of the original word is not settled with absolute precision, it may be that it more properly denotes a dissipated, dissolute, disorderly state, in which the people had thrown off discipline and restraint, and given themselves up to every excess of revelling and riot. Thus the Gr. 'were dissipated, for Aaron had dissipated them.' Parkhurst renders it *to break loose, or start aside*, as from the true religion and worship; parallel to which he says is the usage of the term, Prov. 29. 18. 'Where there is no vision the people perish (יִפָּרֵץ *yipparü*);' rather, 'the people break away or apostatize,' or as the Vulg. renders, *will be dissipated*. So 2 Chron. 27. 19, 'For the Lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of Israel; for he made Judah naked.' Gr. 'Because he utterly apostatized from the Lord.' — ¶ *Unto their shame.* Heb. לְשִׁמְתָּא *leshimtza*, *to infamy*; i. e. when the report of their foul revolt should spread abroad. Chal. 'To blot them with an evil name in their generations. Gr. 'For Aaron had dissipated them for a rejoicing to their adversaries;' i. e. so as to give their enemies cause of exultation and triumph over them.

26. *Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, &c.* Some place probably about the outskirts of the camp, answering in a rude way to the gate of a city, where courts of judgment were wont to sit, hear causes, and give sentence. — ¶ *Who is on the Lord's side? let him come to me.* Heb. מִי לַיהוָה אֵלֵי *mi laihovah ëli*, *whosoever (is) for the*

every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and <sup>h</sup>slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor.

<sup>h</sup> Numb. 25. 5. Deut. 33. 9.

*Lord—to me!*—where the words 'let him come' are omitted through the impassioned earnestness of the speaker. ¶ *All the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him.* This can hardly be understood literally, as it is clearly implied, Deut. 33. 9, that some of the Levites were slain, and consequently that some of them were involved in the guilt of this transaction. By 'all' therefore we are to understand, perhaps, that all who did assemble were sons of Levi, and that of them there was a very large number.

27. *Put every man his sword by his side, &c.* Judgment was here to be executed by commission, and not by the immediate hand of God himself, as in some other instances of aggravated transgression. It was indeed a trying test to which the fidelity of the faithful was now to be submitted in becoming the executioners of their own brethren, and without distinction of sex, age, or relation, to imbrue their hands in the blood of those that were most dear to them. But the offence was one of the most aggravated character; one by which the honor of God's great name had been sadly tarnished; and in order to a more effectual vindication of it, judgment was to be executed with terrible severity. — ¶ *Go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp.* This is no doubt to be understood as a commission to slay every one whom they should meet in the open places of the camp, let him be relation, friend, or neighbor, while they were not required to enter into any of the tents, inasmuch as those who were sensible of the divine



28 And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses: and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men.

29 <sup>i</sup>For Moses had said, Consecrate yourselves to-day to the LORD, even every man upon his son, and upon his brother; that he

<sup>i</sup> Numb. 25. 11, 12, 13. Deut. 13. 6,—11. & 33. 9, 10. <sup>1</sup> Sam. 15. 18, 22. Prov. 21. 3. Zech. 13. 3. Matt. 10. 37.

displeasure might be presumed to be there employed in secret in bemoaning their own or the iniquity of their brethren. None were executed but those who openly and boldly stood forth.—

¶ *Slay every man his brother, &c.* That is, let those who are on the Lord's side slay all the rest who have apostatized, even their nearest relations.

28. *The children of Levi did according to the word of Moses.* Their numbers were incomparably less than those of the rest of the people, yet acting under and animated by a divine commission, they hesitated not to encounter them sword in hand. Their victims, on the other hand, were probably so disheartened by conscious guilt, and so confounded and intimidated by the authority of Moses, that they made no resistance.

29. *For Moses had said, &c.* This discloses the reason of the zeal and alacrity of the Levites in this trying service. They had been informed by Moses that the inflicting of vengeance on their guilty brethren would be a service so acceptable to God, that they would by performing it secure his 'blessing' by being confirmed in the sacerdotal office, and should by this act, as it were, 'consecrate' and initiate themselves unto God as by an offering of sacrifice. Accordingly it is said to the same purpose, Deut. 33. 8—10, 'And of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one, &c., who said unto his father and

may bestow upon you a blessing this day.

30 ¶ And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, <sup>k</sup>Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the LORD; <sup>l</sup>peradventure I shall <sup>m</sup>make an atonement for your sin.

<sup>k</sup> <sup>1</sup> Sam. 12. 20, 23. Luke 15. 18. <sup>l</sup> <sup>2</sup> Sam. 16. 12. Amos 5. 15. <sup>m</sup> Numb. 25. 13.

to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children; for they have observed thy word and kept thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law; they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt sacrifice upon thine altars.' This act of obedience was a kind of inauguration, though a fearful one, of the tribe into their holy office. They thus wiped away as it were the stain which adhered to the escutcheon of their tribe from the conduct of their father Levi, who had wielded his sword unto sin in the affair of the Shechemites, Gen. 34. 25, in consequence of which he lost the blessing which would otherwise have been conferred upon him, and which the faithful and devoted conduct of his sons may be said to have regained.—

¶ *Consecrate.* Heb. מלאו ידכם *milu yedkem, fill your hands.* On the appropriate significance of this term, see Note on Ex. 29. 9.—¶ *That he may bestow upon you a blessing.* The blessing of preferment to the rank of God's special ministers in the service of his house.

30. *Ye have sinned a great sin.* From this it appears that *all* the guilty were not cut off by the sword of the executioners. But those who *were* destroyed were probably the individuals who headed the rebellion, and of whom it was fit to make a signal example in order to inspire the rest with a salutary dread. The fact of their exemption

31 And Moses <sup>n</sup>returned unto the LORD, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have <sup>o</sup>made them gods of gold.

32 Yet now, if thou wilt forgive

<sup>n</sup> Deut. 9. 18. <sup>o</sup> ch. 20. 23.

from the fatal stroke might possibly beget, in their minds, the persuasion that their guilt was not of a very deep dye; but Moses here acquaints them to the contrary. He assures them that they—even *they*—had ‘sinned a great sin;’ and not only so, he even expresses himself as if he deemed it somewhat questionable whether it would be consistent with the honor of God to grant them forgiveness. ‘I will go up unto the Lord; *peradventure* I shall make an atonement for your sin.’ He thought he might perhaps be made *an instrument of reconciliation*; for in no other sense could *atonement* be properly predicated of Aaron’s agency on this occasion. He was not without hope, nor yet was he destitute of fear; accordingly his words were calculated to preserve the people in a due medium between desponding dread and presumptuous confidence. Such is the usual style of the Scriptures in their addresses to flagrant sinners. Amos, 5. 15, ‘*It may be* that the Lord God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph.’ Jonah, 1. 6, ‘What meanest thou, O sleeper? arise, call upon thy God, *if so be* that God will think upon us, that we perish not.’ Acts, 8. 22, ‘Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, *if perhaps* the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.’

31. *And Moses returned.* From a comparison of this with the subsequent parts of the narrative we infer that this withdrawal from the people was not the same with that of forty days’ duration of which Moses thus speaks, Deut. 9. 18, ‘And I fell down before the Lord, as at the first, forty days and forty

their sin: and if not, <sup>p</sup>blot me, I pray thee, <sup>q</sup>out of thy book which thou hast written.

<sup>p</sup> Ps. 69. 28. Rom. 9. 3. <sup>q</sup> Ps. 56. 8. & 139. 16. Dan. 12. 1. Phil. 4. 3. Rev. 3. 5. & 13. 8. & 17. 8. & 20. 12, 15. & 21. 27. & 22. 19.

nights; I did neither eat bread, nor drink water, because of all your sins which ye sinned, in doing wickedly in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger.’ The train of events is not very clearly detailed, but we are forced to the conclusion that Moses retired for a short time to consult the Most High once or twice in the interval between the first and second protracted term of forty days. See the remarks upon the order of occurrences in the next chapter.—¶ *Oh, this people have sinned a great sin*, &c. The impassioned and pathetic tone in which he begins his prayer is very remarkable. He speaks like one who is overwhelmed with horror at the enormity of the sin, for the pardon of which he pleads. The Scriptures deal but sparingly in such interjectional phrases as the present, and wherever they occur they indicate the most profound emotion in the speaker. But Moses knew well, as do all other saints, that nothing is so efficacious in obtaining mercy as deep humiliation before God.

32. *Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin.* This is an imperfect sentence, and ought undoubtedly to be printed as it is in many English editions of the Bible—‘Yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin—; if not,’ &c. The Gr. has, ‘If thou wilt forgive them the sin, forgive them.’ Several modern versions propose to supply the ellipsis in like manner; but the suspension of the meaning by such an expressive break is far more significant than any word which could be introduced to fill it up.—¶ *Blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book*; called Ps. 69. 29, ‘the book of the living;’ Phil. 4. 3, ‘the book of life;’ Ezek. 13

33 And the LORD said unto Moses, <sup>r</sup> Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.

34 Therefore now go, lead the people unto *the place* of which I

<sup>r</sup> Lev. 23. 30. Ezek. 18. 4.

9, 'the writing of the house of Israel.' The meaning is, let my name be no more in the number of those whom thou hast destined to live; let me die with my people. For as the phrase, Is. 4. 3, 'to be written with the living,' signifies to be preserved alive while others die, so to be blotted out of the book of the living is tantamount to being taken out of life while others survive. There is no intimation in these words of any secret book of the divine decrees, or of any thing involving the question of Moses' final salvation or perdition. He simply expressed the wish rather to die than to witness the destruction of his people. The phraseology is in allusion, probably, to the custom of having the names of a community enrolled in a register, and whenever one died, of erasing his name from the number.

33. *Whosoever hath sinned against me, &c.* This seems intended to declare a general rule of proceeding in the divine government, in which an assurance is given that the innocent shall not be confounded with the guilty, but that punishment should fall where it was justly due, and nowhere else. It was in the present case a clear intimation of mercy to the people, assuring their leader that they should not be destroyed in a body, but those only who had merited cutting off by their sin.

34. *Behold mine Angel shall go before thee.* As the term 'Angel' is in several cases in this narrative used as synonymous with the Pillar of Cloud, we should naturally be led to suppose, if the sequel were not inconsistent with it, that the meaning here was, that notwithstanding their recent high handed

have spoken unto thee: <sup>s</sup> Behold, mine Angel shall go before thee: nevertheless, <sup>t</sup> in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.

<sup>s</sup> ch. 33. 2, 14, &c. Numb. 20. 16. <sup>t</sup> Deut. 32. 35. Amos 3. 14. Rom. 2. 5, 6.

iniquity, this guiding signal, this protecting Presence, should still go with them. But upon comparing the passage before us with the words of Moses, ch. 33. 12—16, it appears obvious that he took the word in a more general sense as simply indicating *some kind of providential agency* which should be exerted in their behalf while pursuing their journey through the wilderness. That this is a legitimate sense of the word 'Angel' any one may be convinced by referring to the scriptural use of the term as fully detailed in the Note on Ex. 3. 2. The promise, therefore, though consoling was yet vague. It left Moses in doubt as to the real character of the Angel, i. e. agency, which he was taught to expect. Accordingly in his prayer in the ensuing chapter he earnestly beseeches for more precise information, and desires that no other than the particular 'Angel of the presence' the majestic Shekinah, should accompany them. — *¶ Nevertheless, in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.* That is, when I have occasion to visit them in judgment for other offences, I will remember their sin on this occasion, and increase their punishment on account of it. Accordingly it has always remained as a tradition among the Jews, even to the present day, that in whatever afflictions they have been made to experience there was mingled at least an ounce of the powder of the golden calf. The intimation conveys an important practical lesson to the people of God in all ages. The effects of one sin may go to enhance the punishment of another, and so we may have constant memorials

35 And the LORD plagued the people, because <sup>u</sup>they made the calf which Aaron made.

#### CHAPTER XXXIII.

AND the LORD said unto Moses, Depart *and* go up hence,

<sup>u</sup> 2 Sam. 12. 9. Acts 7. 41.

of a particular offence throughout the chastening discipline of a whole life.

35. *And the Lord plagued the people, &c.* It is not clear that this statement refers to any particular plague or pestilence which occurred *at this time* among the people. It may be understood of the subsequent scourges and calamities which they suffered during their sojourn in the wilderness as long as Moses lived. In this case it is but another mode of saying that the threatening denounced in the preceding verse was actually fulfilled in their after experience as a nation. At the same time, as there is no doubt that the order of events is very much transposed in this part of the narrative, there is nothing actually to forbid the supposition that the plague or stroke here mentioned is no other than the slaughter of the three thousand recorded in the next chapter. Indeed we think this on the whole the preferable interpretation.—¶ *Because they made, &c.* That is, because they caused or procured to be made; a phraseology of very frequent occurrence. Thus, Acts, 1. 18, Judas is said to have purchased a field, which in fact, was purchased by the priests, but it is attributed to Judas because his receiving and then returning the money, was the occasion of its being bought. The originators and procurers of evil are not to promise themselves impunity because they have prevailed upon others to become their tools in its execution. The consequences will ‘return to plague the inventors.’ God’s judgment is always according to truth, and he will charge home guilt where it properly belongs.

thou <sup>a</sup> and the people which thou hast brought up out of the land of Egypt, unto the land which I swear unto Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, saying, <sup>b</sup>Unto thy seed will I give it:

<sup>a</sup> ch. 32. 7. <sup>b</sup> Gen. 12. 7. ch. 32. 13.

‘Deos qui rogat, ille facit,’ *he who asks for gods makes them.*

#### CHAPTER XXXIII.

The right adjustment of the events of this chapter in the chronological order of the narrative, is a matter attended with some difficulty. From the rendering of our established version it would seem, that what was now said to Moses was posterior in point of time to the incidents recorded in the close of the preceding chapter; but from an attentive consideration and collation of the tenor of the whole, we are persuaded, with Calvin and other critics of note, that the proper rendering of v. 1, is in the pluperfect—‘the Lord *had* said’—and that the appropriate place for the interview and incidents here related is *prior* to the order and the promise contained v. 34 of ch. 32. In that verse God declares his purpose of sending his angel before the people, and we naturally enquire how it happens that such an assurance was necessary? Was there any danger that an angel would *not* be sent? Had any intimation been given that his guiding and protecting presence would be withdrawn? To this the correct answer undoubtedly is, that all that is related in ch. 33, had occurred *anterior* to the promise made in ch. 32. 34. God had threatened to send Moses and the people forward without the accompanying presence of the Angel of the Shekinah, and it was only in consequence of the fervent intercession of Moses that he was induced to retract this dread determination. In the foregoing chapter, therefore, the historian *merely*

2 <sup>c</sup> And I will send an angel before thee; <sup>d</sup> and I will drive out the Canaanite, the Amorite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite:

<sup>c</sup> ch. 32. 34. & 34. 11. <sup>d</sup> Deut. 7. 22. Josh. 24. 11

states in a summary way the fact of his earnest prayer and the concession made to it; in the present, he goes back and relates minutely the train of circumstances which preceded and led to the declaration above mentioned. In doing this he virtually makes known to us one main ground of the urgency of his supplications. He was afraid that God would withdraw the tokens of his visible presence. As a punishment for the mad attempt of the people to supply themselves with a *false* symbol of his presence, he was apprehensive he might be provoked to take from them the *true*, and hence his impassioned entreaty that God would not visit them with so sore a judgment. But the particulars will disclose themselves as we proceed.

1. *And the Lord said.* Heb. יְיָ דַבֵּר *va-yedabber Yehovah, and Jehovah had said*; as the like phrase is often elsewhere to be translated. It is only the context in such cases that determines the true mode of rendering.—

¶ *Depart and go up hence, &c.* These words, and what immediately follows, appear to have been spoken by God to Moses during his first sojourn upon the summit of the mount, and upon the occasion of the making of the golden calf. In sovereign displeasure he turns the people over, as it were, upon Moses, whom he represents as having brought them out of Egypt, rather than himself; and though he promises to make good his covenant with Abraham, and give them the land of Canaan, yet he intimates that they shall go forward without the extraordinary tokens of his

3 <sup>e</sup> Unto a land flowing with milk and honey: <sup>f</sup> for I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou *art* a stiff-necked people: lest <sup>h</sup> I consume thee in the way.

<sup>e</sup> ch. 3. 8. <sup>f</sup> ver. 15. 17. <sup>g</sup> ch. 32. 9. & 31. 9. Deut. 9. 6, 13. <sup>h</sup> ch. 23. 21. & 32. 10. Numb. 16. 21. 45.

presence which they had hitherto enjoyed, and which would have been continued to them but for their sin. Such language imports, however, a reserved prerogative of change in the dispensation announced if adequate reasons for it should occur.

2. *And I will send an angel before thee.* This clause is not to be understood as spoken to Moses, but is to be read in connexion with the preceding, v. 1, as a part of the promise to the fathers and their seed, which God is here reciting. The promise of the emissary angel was not, indeed, expressly made to either of the patriarchs here mentioned, but it was expressly made to the Israelites, Ex. 23. 20, and the whole is here brought together as one integral promise.

3. *For I will not go up in the midst of thee, &c.* Chal. 'I will not make my Shekinah (שְׁכִינָתִי *shekinti*) to go up in the midst of thee.' Arab. 'I will not make my Light (or Splendor) to go up among you.' Having recited the promise formerly made of conducting them into Canaan by the medium of the Angel of his presence, or the Shekinah, the Lord here ostensibly retracts his promise and announces a contrary intention. So perverse, stiff-necked, and rebellious had they proved, that they were to consider themselves as having forfeited the favor of such a presence, and as being righteously exposed to be left in utter destitution of the symbol of their glory. Yet the well-grounded remark of Scott is ever to be borne in mind, that 'such declarations rather express what God justly might do, what

4 ¶ And when the people heard these evil tidings, <sup>i</sup> they mourned: <sup>k</sup> and no man did put on him his ornaments.

5 For the LORD had said unto Moses, Say unto the children of

<sup>i</sup> Numb. 14. 1, 39. <sup>k</sup> Lev. 10. 6. 2 Sam. 19. 24. 1 Kings 21. 27. 2 Kings 19. 1. Esther 4. 1, 4. Ezra 9. 3. Job 1. 20. & 2. 12. Isai. 32. 11. Ezek. 24. 17, 23. & 26. 16.

it would become him to do, and what he would do, were it not for some intervening consideration, than his *irreversible* purpose; and always imply a reserved exception, in case the party offending were truly penitent.'—  
¶ *Lest I consume thee in the way.* Lest I should be constrained, by a just regard to my own glory, to come out in consuming wrath against your iniquities.

4, 5. *When the people heard these evil tidings, they mourned.* The announcement was probably made to the people when Moses first came down from the mount, and after breaking the tables of stone. Their humiliation, therefore, took place in the interval between the first and second period of forty days, during which Moses withdrew himself from the congregation for the purpose of prayer and fasting. The effect produced showed that they were deeply sensible of the value of the blessing which they were likely to lose. They were at once filled with grief, which expressed itself by the usual external badges of 'mourning,' viz., divesting themselves of their ornaments, although it appears from v. 5, that this was at the same time in obedience to an express command of Jehovah. This was not only in order that they might evince the appropriate tokens of sorrow and humiliation, but also that they could make sacrifices to God as well as to a golden calf. While thus disrobed of their festive garments and precious jewels, and clad in the habit of penitents, God represents him-

Israel, <sup>l</sup> *Ye are a stiff-necked people:* I will come up <sup>m</sup> into the midst of thee in a moment, and consume thee: therefore now put off thy ornaments from thee, that I may <sup>n</sup> know what to do unto thee.

<sup>l</sup> ver. 3. <sup>m</sup> See Numb. 16. 45, 46. <sup>n</sup> Deut. 8. 2. Ps. 139. 23.

self as deliberating how to act towards them. But when God speaks of himself in this language, as if perplexed and wavering in his mind, it is not to be understood as intimating that such things *actually* exist; for 'known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world;' nor can any occasion possibly arise in which he can be at a loss how to act. But he is pleased to speak in this way of himself in order to accommodate himself to our feeble apprehensions. Compare Hos. 6. 4. and Jer. 3. 19, where also the Most High speaks as if perplexed in his mind about the line of conduct he should pursue, and as wishing to show mercy, but not knowing how to do it consistently with his own honor. All this is plainly capable of a sense entirely consistent with the reverence due to the Supreme Being. But while it is intimated that so long as impenitence continues *he knows not how* to exercise mercy to the sinner, it is at the same time implied, that when once humbled for their iniquities he is at no loss how to act towards them; he can then give free scope to the merciful and compassionate disposition of his own heart. So it is clear that the language in the present case implied a design of mercy, provided they showed signs of repentance, and as they *did* demean themselves as those who were conscious of their delinquencies and sincerely mourned, we may suppose that this fact added its weight to the fervency of Moses' prayers to give them prevalence with God in their behalf.

6 And the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments by the mount Horeb.

7 And Moses took the tabernacle, and pitched it without the camp afar off from the camp, ° and

° ch. 29. 42, 43.

6. *By the mount Horeb.* Heb. מֵהַר מְהָר *mēhar Horēb*, *from mount Horeb*. That is, at a considerable distance from it, as not worthy to stand in immediate proximity to it. The form of the expression, however, in that sense is so singular, that we are strongly inclined to regard the preposition 'from' as a particle of *time* rather than of *place*, implying that from the time of the occurrence of this transaction at Horeb, they divested themselves of their ornaments, and continued to dispense with them during the remainder of their sojourning. Thus it is said, Num. 14. 19, 'As thou hast forgiven this people *from Egypt* even until now;' i.e. from the time of their being in Egypt. Why may not the phrase 'from Horeb' in the one instance be equivalent to 'from Egypt' in the other? See this usage of speech more fully illustrated in the Note on Gen. 2. 10.

7. *And Moses took the tabernacle, &c.* Heb. הָאֹהֶל *ha-ohel*, *the tent*. It is evident that the tabernacle or tent here mentioned could not be that concerning which Moses had before received directions, for that was not yet built; nor is it at all probable that the private tent of Moses is to be understood, for it appears v. 8, that Moses himself went back and forth to and from this tabernacle as well as the rest of the congregation, from which it is to be inferred that he, as well as they, ordinarily resided within the camp. The probability therefore is that the Israelites, previous to the erection of the prescribed tabernacle, had some kind of sacred tent or portable temple for the public performance of religious rites, which Moses,

called it the Tabernacle of the Congregation. And it came to pass, *that* every one which sought the LORD, went out unto the tabernacle of the congregation, which *was* without the camp.

P Deut. 4. 29. 2 Sam. 21. 1.

as an argument of God's displeasure against Israel, on this occasion, ordered to be removed from a camp so grossly profaned by idol-worship. It is indeed objected to this, that this tabernacle now first began to be honored with a new designation, and called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד *ohel mo'ed*, *the tabernacle of convention*, which is inconsistent with the idea of its having *previously* been employed for such a purpose. But to this it may be replied, that nothing forbids the rendering the clause in the pluperfect, and considering it as introduced parenthetically—'And took the tabernacle and pitched it without the camp afar off from the camp (for he had called it the Tabernacle of Convention); and it came to pass,' &c. It was so called because such was its object and use. It had hitherto served this purpose in the midst of the camp; but now as a sign of the divine alienation and displeasure, and in order to quicken and deepen their penitence, it was to be removed from its former position, and stationed at a distance from a locality which had forfeited its longer continuance upon it. The withdrawal was an intimation to their senses of the fact announced by Moses of their purposed dereliction by Jehovah's presence. He had before promised, ch. 25. 8, to dwell among them, in the midst of them, and as the oracular presence of the Deity was supposed to be especially connected with a *tent* or *tabernacle*, it may be supposed that this temporary erection had been prepared with that view, until the larger and more magnificent one designed by God himself should be built. But so

8 And it came to pass when Moses went out into the tabernacle, *that* all the people rose up, and stood every man *at* his tent-door, and looked after Moses, until he was gone into the tabernacle.

q Numb. 16. 27.

aggravated and enormous had been the offence recently committed, that the Most High proceeds now to indicate in a visible manner the retraction of his gracious promise, and instead of fixing the symbols of his presence in the camp, to cause them to be removed and planted far away from the places which had contracted such foul defilement.

—¶ *Every one which sought the Lord.* Chal. 'Every one which sought doctrine (or information) from before the face of the Lord—went forth to the tabernacle of the house of doctrine which was without the camp.' The removal of the tabernacle took away of course the facilities which the people had formerly enjoyed for consulting the divine oracle. This they could no more do in the camp, but were obliged for the purpose to go abroad to the place where God was henceforth pleased to manifest his presence. It is evident, therefore, that it was not a total withdrawal of the tokens of the divine favor. The Most High still proclaimed himself willing to be sought unto. Intimations of mercy were thus mingled with the signs of displeasure, lest the spirit should faint before him and the souls which he had made.' It may still, however, be regarded as probable that the people here spoken of did not actually enter *into* the tabernacle—a privilege apparently reserved for Moses alone—but only approached *towards* it themselves, while Moses acted as their advocate in the business which had brought them out.

8. *It came to pass when Moses went out, &c.* The particulars here mentioned are not, as we suppose, to be un-

9 And it came to pass, as Moses entered into the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended and stood *at* the door of the tabernacle, and *the LORD* *r*talked with Moses.

r ch. 25. 22. & 31. 18. Ps. 99. 7.

derstood as having occurred on one special occasion only, but as being the ordinary accompaniments, for several days together, of Moses' ingress into the sacred tent whenever he entered it. His ordinary residence was doubtless in the camp with his family, but in his office of intercessor, mediator, and judge, he had repeated occasions to go forth to this tent to hold interviews with Jehovah; and whenever this was the case, as he was acting on the behalf of the people, it was natural that they should watch with intense solicitude the visible indications of the issue of the affair. Thus the disciples 'looked after' our Lord Jesus, when he ascended on high to enter into the holy place not made with hands, till 'a cloud received him out of their sight, as Moses here.' *Henry.* The station of the tabernacle, we think it probable, was somewhere on the side of the mountain, far indeed below the summit, and yet in some conspicuous locality, that might be seen by most of the multitude below. The topographical features of the region are such that if the tent were *without* the camp it must necessarily be upon some elevated ground, as all the valleys or wadys would of course be occupied by the tents of the congregation.

9. *The cloudy pillar descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle, &c.* It descended from the summit to the less elevated part of the mountain where the Tabernacle stood. As the sublime object had probably remained entirely stationary for at least forty days, we can easily imagine that it must have produced a deep sensation



10 And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand *at* the tabernacle-door: and all the people rose

up and <sup>s</sup> worshipped, every man *in* his tent-door.

<sup>s</sup> ch. 4. 21.

among the people to see it now again majestically moving from its place, and transferring itself down the mountain to the spot where the tent was fixed, and where Moses had now repaired. This would indeed verify the claim of the sacred structure to the title of 'Tabernacle of Meeting,' when Jehovah by his symbol was thus pleased to *meet* with his servant in this open and honorary manner, in the sight of the awe-struck host. The effect would naturally be to inspire additional reverence for the person and authority of Moses, as one whom God saw fit to distinguish by the indubitable seal of his own selection, and to endow with the highest prerogatives of a human mediator. The descent of the cloudy pillar at the door of the tent would also tend to assure them that the rupture between God and his people was not utterly past healing. Though withdrawn, in the withdrawing of the Tabernacle, from the midst of them, he was still accessible. With due reverence and patience and prostration of spirit they might still approach him, notwithstanding his offended majesty maintained a lofty and awful reserve which could not but engender some measure of trembling suspense. Nor is such an attitude unwonted to the Holy One of Israel. He often hides his face from sinners that he may the more effectually incite them to seek him with broken hearts. Under his fatherly chastisement, therefore, we are not to give way so far to the promptings of terror or conscious guilt as to forbear to seek him, but even though from afar to make our earnest suit towards him. So long as the tokens of his presence are not entirely removed, we are not permitted to nourish our despair.—¶ *And the Lord talked with Moses.* The words 'the Lord' are evi-

dently supplied, as if there were in the original an ellipsis of the proper subject of the verb. But we have no doubt that the correct rendering is yielded by the omission of this phrase. The writer *intended* to say that the cloudy pillar talked with Moses; nor is any thing farther necessary to justify the expression than a reference to the view, so often repeated in the preceding Notes, of the Shekinah of the Old Testament economy. The aerial column, as the enclosing receptacle of the inner 'Glory' was the symbol of the Lord's presence to his people, and was the visible organ of the communication of his will. In this character it bore the name, displayed the attributes, and claimed the honors, of Jehovah himself. Nothing can be more pertinent to this point than the language of the Psalmist, Ps. 99. 7, 'He spake to them in the cloudy pillar.' It would be easy to enlarge upon this explanation, and to show its immense importance as a clue to the solution of a multitude of passages which speak of the divine manifestations, but the extended Note at the close of chapter 14, to which the reader is referred, will preclude the necessity of any fuller discussion of the text before us.

10. *All the people rose up and worshipped, every man in his tent door.* This is sometimes erroneously interpreted of the more civil respect and homage paid by the people to Moses as he passed by the doors of their tents on his way to the Tabernacle of the Congregation. It was unquestionably a worship rendered to God in token of their devout and grateful acknowledgement of his goodness in restoring to them, even though at a distance, the symbol of his gracious presence. It was a virtual profession that, whatever had been their past obliquities, they

11 And 'the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend. And he

† Gen. 32. 30. Numb. 12. 8. Deut. 34. 10.

now considered him as the only proper object of adoration, and would henceforth pay their homage to him alone. It was an act of humble reverence very naturally prompted by the circumstances in which they were placed. How must their hearts have beat with tremulous anxiety as they stood at their tent-doors and 'looked after Moses until he had gone into the Tabernacle!' Their encampment they had so sadly defiled by their sin that they could not but have deep misgivings whether Jehovah would any more return to them or accept their sacrifices, or listen to their prayers and praises. They could not but ask themselves, whether he would indeed meet Moses and them that sought him at the Tabernacle without the camp. What a relief then to such doubts as these to see the cloudy pillar descend! How gladdening to their souls to behold even this partial intimation of the reconcileableness of their offended sovereign! In the honor thus put upon their leader and advocate they could not but read a token of good to themselves. They had put off their ornaments in obedience to the divine injunction, and now doubtless stood with tears of repentance awaiting the indications of mercy or wrath. To the joy of their hearts they behold the signal of favor and forgiveness, and see themselves spared in that they feared! How then could they fail to give vent to the admiring and adoring sentiments of their bosoms by falling down, as prostrate worshippers, and acknowledging the clemency of the Most High!

11. *And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.* That is, familiarly and plainly, not in visions, dreams, or dark ora-

turned again into the camp; but 'his servant Joshua the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tabernacle.

‡ ch. 24. 13.

cles—a privilege peculiar to Moses; Num. 12. 6—8, 'If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all my house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold.' It is clear however, that this must be understood in such a way as not to conflict with what is said, v. 20, 'Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live.' There is a sense in which God never has been nor can be seen. Comp. John 1. 8. Col. 1. 15. 1 Tim. 6. 16. Indeed we have no reason to suppose that a purely spiritual being can in the nature of things be made visible to mortal eyes. We do not even see each other's spirits. We only see the outward material forms through which, as a medium, the inward spirit manifests itself. So in the present case. What Moses saw and held communion with was not God in his intimate essence, but God in his sensible symbol of the Shekinah, and this as we have before remarked is repeatedly called his 'Face' or 'Presence.' See Note on Ex. 25. 30. Understood in this sense all difficulty vanishes at once, and leaves the two passages in entire harmony with each other.—Chal. 'And God spake unto Moses word to word.' Gr. *ενωπιον ενωπιω*, *presence to presence*.—† *His servant Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tabernacle.* As it is difficult to conceive for what purpose Joshua could have been required to remain in the Tabernacle after Moses had left it, there seems to be good ground for

12 ¶ And Moses said unto the LORD, See, \* thou sayest unto me, Bring up this people: and thou hast not let me know whom thou

\* ch. 32. 34.

adopting the rendering of Junius and Tremellius, approved by Pool, Patrick, Rivet, Scott, and others, which runs thus;—‘He turned again into the camp, (he) and his servant Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man; but he (i. e. the Lord, as appearing in the cloud) departed not out of the Tabernacle.’ The original will not only admit of this version, but the disposition of the accents seems rather to require it. Add to this, that the phrase ‘out of the tabernacle,’ is in the Hebrew ‘out of the midst of the tabernacle,’ which is more correctly applicable to the symbol of the Presence, for we have no intimation that any other person than Moses went into the Tabernacle, who seems to have been alone admitted to the honor of conversing with the divine Majesty. We have little hesitation therefore, on the whole, in adopting this as the true sense.—As to the epithet ‘young man’ applied to Joshua, it cannot be predicated of his age, for he was now about fifty-three years old; but he was a young man compared with Moses, and the original term נָעָר *naar* is often applied to one on the ground of his acting in a *ministerial* or *servile* capacity, as is clearly shown in the Note on Gen. 14. 24.

12. *And Moses said unto the Lord, &c.* There are few portions of the entire Pentateuch where it is so difficult to settle with precision the order of events as in the narrative before us. As to the present interview, there can be but little doubt that it took place before Moses went to pass the second forty days in the mount, but whether it is to be referred to the time when he interceded with God before coming

wilt send with me. Yet thou hast said, y I know thee by name, and thou hast also found grace in my sight.

y ver. 17. Gen. 18. 19. Ps. 1. 6. Jer. 1. 5. John 10. 14, 15. 2 Tim. 2. 19.

down with the tables, or to some subsequent date in the interval between the two forty-days’ sojourns, is questioned by commentators. For ourselves, as before remarked, we incline to the opinion which supposes a transposition of events, and that this prayer of Moses was really offered at the time when he returned unto the Lord, ch. 32. 31, and obtained the promise of an emissary angel, ch. 32. 34. But ‘Angel,’ is a term of large and somewhat indefinite import, implying *any kind of providential agency* by means of which Omnipotence might see fit to execute its plans. Moses therefore was desirous of *more particular* information. He wished to have the accompanying presence not merely of *an* Angel, but of *the* Angel, i. e. the Angel of the divine Face; the same Angel which had hitherto conducted their march in the Cloudy Pillar. In urging his plea for the bestowment of this blessing, he avails himself of the interest which he himself had with God as a special object of his favor, as one whom he ‘knew by name,’ i. e. as a particular friend and confidant, rendered in the Gr. ‘I know thee above all;’ and in the Arab. ‘I have ennobled thy name.’ God had offered to destroy the whole nation of Israel, and raise up another from Moses’ loins, and this token of good-will he lays hold of as a ground of hope that the object of his entreaty would not be denied him. It is not indeed to be supposed that in using this language Moses claimed a degree of personal merit sufficient to be the foundation of such a request, but he knew that one favor on the part of God was a pledge and precursor of others, and probably the

13 Now therefore, I pray thee, <sup>z</sup>if I have found grace in thy sight, <sup>a</sup>shew me now thy way, that I may know thee, that I may find

<sup>z</sup> ch. 34. 9. <sup>a</sup> Ps. 25. 4. & 27. 11. & 86. 11. & 119. 33.

very fact that he, notwithstanding his unworthiness, had been so graciously dealt with, was the moving cause of his earnest petition for still farther manifestations of his kindness and care. As God had been good to him in despite of his deserts, why might he not sue for augmented acts of clemency?

13. *Shew me now thy way.* That is, show me the way in which thou wouldst have thy people conducted to their inheritance. Show me thy views and purposes, thine *intended ways* of acting and thy requirements of me in reference to this great object. Gr. *εμφανίσαι μοι σεαυτον*, *discover thyself to me.* Chal. 'Show me the way of thy goodness.' Arab. 'Show me the ways of thy good-will.' Sam. 'Show me thy ways.'—¶ *That I may know thee, that I may find grace in thy sight.* It will be observed that the plea here is peculiar, and the logic such as can be fully appreciated only by a pious heart. He makes the fact of his having found grace already an argument for his finding still more. 'Lord, if it be so that I have indeed found acceptance with thee, then may I not confidently implore of thee that thou wouldst manifest thy mind and will to thy servant, so that in obeying it, I may continue to experience the uninterrupted and growing exhibitions of thy favor towards me. Grant me *light* that I may continue to yield thee *love*.'—¶ *Consider that this nation is thy people.* In the spirit of true prayer he presses into his service every argument that can increase the cogency of his plea. He does not beg the desired favor merely

on the ground of what he might be permitted to urge on his own account, but he reminds the Most High that the people of whom he was constituted leader stood in a peculiar relation to him their covenant God and Portion. He had chosen their fathers, he had delivered them from bondage, he had adopted them as his own, he had crowned them with precious promises, and by all the ties which bound them to himself he beseeches that he would not leave nor cast them off. Though utterly unworthy, yet consider that they are *thine*.

14 And he said, <sup>c</sup>My presence shall go *with thee*, and I will give thee <sup>d</sup>rest.

<sup>b</sup> Deut. 9. 26, 29. Joel 2. 17. <sup>c</sup> ch. 13. 21. & 40. 34.—38. Isai. 63. 9. <sup>d</sup> Deut. 3. 20. Josh. 21. 44. & 22. 4. & 23. 1. Ps. 95. 11.

on the ground of what he might be permitted to urge on his own account, but he reminds the Most High that the people of whom he was constituted leader stood in a peculiar relation to him their covenant God and Portion. He had chosen their fathers, he had delivered them from bondage, he had adopted them as his own, he had crowned them with precious promises, and by all the ties which bound them to himself he beseeches that he would not leave nor cast them off. Though utterly unworthy, yet consider that they are *thine*.

14. *And he said, My presence shall go with thee.* Heb. *פני ה' ילכו panai yēl'ku*, *my face shall go.* Chal. 'My Majesty (*שכינתו shekinti*, *my Shekinah*) shall go.' Arab. 'My Light (or Splendor) shall walk with thee until I cause thee to rest.' The prayer of Moses at length prevails. Jehovah vouchsafes to him a definite assurance, that the object of his suit, viz., the same visible symbol of the divine presence which they had hitherto enjoyed, should be granted to accompany the host in their onward march to Canaan. More than this they did not need, and less than this could never satisfy one who had thus experienced the divine guidance and protection. This Presence was in truth no other than what is called, Is. 63. 9, 'the Angel of God's presence,' who saved, sustained, and guided the chosen people all the days of old. As to the relation which this Presence-angel bore to Christ in his human manifestation, see the Note on the Cloudy Pillar at the close of the thirteenth

15 And he said unto him, <sup>e</sup>If thy presence go not *with me*, carry us not up hence.

16 For wherein shall it be known here that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? <sup>f</sup>*Is it not in that thou goest with us?*

<sup>e</sup> ver. 3. ch. 34. 9. <sup>f</sup> Numb. 14. 14.

chapter.—¶ *And I will give thee rest.* That is, by subduing all thine enemies and planting thee in triumph in the land of promise—a promise made, however, not to Moses in person, but to the collective people. It is in fact the Presence who is speaking, for it was with the Shekinah that Moses held intercourse throughout the whole of the time embraced in this narrative.

15. *If thy presence go not, &c.* Heb. **אם אין פניך הולכים** *im 'en panika holekim*, *if thy face do not go.* If we have not the peculiar *manifestation* of thy presence through the wonted medium, carry us not up hence. Without this it were better that they should remain, even at the hazard of eventually wasting away, in the desert. With several commentators we take this and the following verse to have been uttered by Moses *before* God gave him the promise in the verse preceding. The proper translation of the opening clause we have little doubt is, 'For Moses *had* said, &c.' The words are intended to discover to us the *reason* of God's giving him the specific promise. It was because Moses had made a specific request to that effect. Otherwise, we cannot see a sufficient ground for his so urgently renewing the petition when God had just engaged to grant it. Was it decorous in him to speak as if he doubted whether Jehovah were really in earnest in what he promised? As to v. 17, which might seem at first view to conflict with this suggestion, we regard it as merely Moses' own record,

So <sup>g</sup>shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that *are* upon the face of the earth.

17 And the LORD said unto Moses, <sup>h</sup>I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken: for thou hast

<sup>g</sup> ch. 34. 10. Deut. 4. 7, 34. 2 Sam. 7. 23. 1 Kings 8. 53. Ps. 147. 20. <sup>h</sup> Gen. 19. 21. James 5. 16.

slightly varied, of what God had said, v. 14. As that answer had come in a little out of place, he here recites the substance of it again. We feel on the whole quite satisfied that all the conversation we are now considering transpired before Moses came down from the interview recorded, ch. 32. 31—35. It was on the same occasion also that he besought a view of the divine glory, though the mention of it was omitted in its proper connexions. Nothing is more common than a similar usage of transposition among the sacred writers.—¶ *So shall we be separated.* Heb. **נִפְלִינוּ** *niphlinu*, *gloriously or marvellously separated*; as the term is explained at length in the Note on Ex. 8. 22. Gr. **ἐνδοξασθῶσιν** *egw te kai o laos sou*, *I shall be glorified and also thy people.* The guidance of the Pillar of Cloud, as the sensible representative of the God of Israel, was the grand and glorious prerogative that distinguished them from all other people. The daily supply of manna was indeed a miraculous token of the divine regard, but it was not so strikingly, so signally, supernatural as the mystic aerial column brightening into a fiery pillar by night, and darkening into a majestic cloud by day. It was not, however, merely as a splendid visible phenomenon that Moses prized its presence. It was because Jehovah was in it. The virtue of his ineffable name; the efficacy of his attributes; the demonstration of his godhead; the preintimative shadow and symbol of his Son, was in it, and it

found grace in my sight, and I know thee by name.

i ver. 12.

was mainly this which gave it value in his eyes.

18. *And he said, I beseech thee, show me thy glory.* Heb. **הִרְאֵנִי נָא אֶת כְּבוֹדְךָ** *har'eni na eth kebodeka, make me I pray thee to see thy glory.* Gr. **εμφανίσσον μοι σεαυτον**, *manifest or display thyself to me.* Arab. 'Show me even thy Light (or Splendor).' The request of Moses, couched in these words, involves considerations of a deep and mysterious nature, before which we are instinctively prompted to shrink back abashed, with covered face and a soul filled with awe. Yet as it forms a part of the sacred record, and was doubtless intended to be understood by those for whose benefit it was written, we may humbly essay to ascertain the true import of the request, together with that of the answer made to it. In stating then our impressions of the drift of these words, we do not hesitate to believe, that Moses, in beseeching that God would grant him a view of his glory, had respect primarily to a *visible glory*, something which could be seen with the bodily eyes, and not merely to a perception of the divine essence or an inward, mental, or spiritual apprehension of the divine attributes. We do not say that the object of his request was *exclusive* of such an inward sense or discovery of the divine perfections as we should perhaps most naturally connect with a sight of the glory of God; but we are still satisfied from the context that the prominent idea conveyed in the words of Moses' request is that of a *sensible manifestation* of the divine glory. From what he had already seen of the previous theophanies vouchsafed to him, and probably also from what he had heard of similar discoveries made to others, he was no doubt led to suppose that there was something still behind—some

18 And he said, I beseech thee, shew me <sup>k</sup>thy glory.

k ver. 20. 1 Tim. 6. 16.

ineffable brightness, or beauty, or majesty,—immensely transcending all that he had hitherto been permitted to witness. He doubtless felt that he had not yet been favored to behold or understand all that was involved in the wondrous symbol of the Shekinah. With its daily sombre aspect and its nightly effulgence his senses were indeed familiar; but he was assured within himself that he had never been enabled to penetrate fully its hidden recesses. Neither his eyes nor his mind had pierced to its central mystery. Accordingly he here expresses an earnest wish to be favored with a deeper insight into this marvellous and mystic object. He would be made acquainted with the nucleus enwrapped in such a splendid envelope. And having thus far prevailed with God by his fervent intercession on behalf of the people, he is emboldened to go still farther in his request, making one concession an argument for seeking another. Whether he conceived that any corporeal semblance would be developed to his vision, we have no means of ascertaining; but we believe he had some dim and shadowy impression that the mystery of the Shekinah had a close relation to the mystery of redemption, and that a preintimation of the future glorious manifested person of the Messiah was in some way couched in this sublime symbol. And in this we cannot question that he was right. The glory of the Shekinah was the Old Testament manifestation of Christ. He was its inner essence. It was he who was the true Face or Presence of Jehovah, and as we have before remarked vol. I. p. 167, one grand object of the Savior's transfiguration on the mount was to afford evidence to the senses of the identity of his glory with that of the

19 And he said, <sup>1</sup>I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the LORD before thee; <sup>m</sup>and will be

<sup>1</sup> ch. 34. 5, 6, 7. Jer. 31. 14. <sup>m</sup> Rom. 9. 15, 16, 18.

ancient Shekinah. Of this truth Moses had undoubtedly a very vague and inadequate conception, and yet the little that he did apprehend of it only stimulated his desire for fuller disclosures. In the answer which God returned, and the partial compliance which he yielded, we seem to read a virtual allowance of the justness of his main impression, grounded no doubt upon the fact, that it was God's design from all eternity to appear to the bodily eyes of his saints in a visible external glory in the person of Christ as God-man mediator. Of this fact all the sensible manifestations which he had made to Moses and other holy men were pre-sages and pledges. Their full import indeed had never been understood, nor was it possible that it should be; yet Moses was led to think it possible that he might be more largely informed upon the subject than he had ever yet been, and God seems not to have been displeased with his desire. Yet he is told that so long as he was in the flesh it could not be gratified to its full extent. The revelation vouchsafed must be governed by the measure of his ability to receive it, and by the useful ends to be answered by it. Accordingly in the reply Jehovah says;

19. *I will make all my goodness pass before thee.* Heb. כָּל טוֹבוֹי kol toobi. Gr. παραλευσσαι προτερος σου τη δοξη μου, *I will pass by before thee with my Glory*; from which it would appear that the Seventy regarded the expression as having reference to a *sensible* and not merely a *mental* manifestation. So also the Arab. 'I will make all my Light (or Splendor) to pass by in thy presence.' The Syriac, however, has 'all my bless-

edness, to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy to whom I will shew mercy.

<sup>n</sup> Rom. 4. 4, 16.

edness,' and the Chal. retains the Heb. 'goodness.' The true import of the original, therefore, remains to be accurately weighed; and this can only be done by a reference to dominant usage. The radical טוֹב *tob*, *good*, as an adjective is expressly used in reference to personal qualities which address themselves to the eye, and to which in English we apply the epithet *goodly*. Thus it is said of Joseph, Gen. 39. 6. that he was '*goodly* and well-favored,' and so of Moses, Ex. 2. 2, that he was '*a goodly child*.' Indeed one of the most common applications of the word in this form is to those properties of objects which come within the cognisance of the outward senses, as any one may be satisfied who will refer either to a Hebrew or English Concordance. The same idea is perhaps still more prominent in the abstract substantive טוֹב *toob*, *goodness*, which is a designation for whatever strikes the senses as *pleasant*, *agreeable*, *beautiful*, *precious*. Thus Gen. 24. 10, 'And the servant took ten camels of the camels of his master, and departed; for all the *goods* (טוֹב) of his were in his hand;' where we have endeavored to show in our Note that the term is used to denote the *rich*, *choice*, and *precious things* which the servant took from his master's effects for a present to Rebekah and her family. Gen. 45. 18, 'I will give you the *good* (טוֹב) of the land of Egypt;' i. e. the choicest and best parts. Deut. 6. 10, 11, 'To give thee great and *goodly* (הַבְּתָר) cities which thou buildedst not, and houses full of all *good things* (טוֹב) which thou filledst not,' &c. Is. 1. 19, 'If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat

the good (טוב) of the land.' In all these cases it is evident that the leading import of the term is that of *sensible* or *physical good*, and not of a *moral attribute* so denominated, which is more frequently expressed by the term חסד *hesed*, as in ch. 34. 6,—'the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in *goodness* (חסד) and truth,' &c. Nor, in reference to the present passage, does it by any means appear how a moral attribute could be properly said to *pass by* or *before* any one. Yet it cannot be questioned that in other connexions, though of rare occurrence, the sense of *moral goodness* or *benignity* is conveyed by the term, or more properly the *fruits* of such an attribute, as Ps. 31. 20.—145. 7. Is. 63. 7. Now in the present instance, if the answer of Jehovah might be supposed to be governed by the tenor of Moses' request, we should naturally expect that the favor promised to be granted would be something which should in some way address itself to the *senses* of the petitioner; for it was doubtless mainly a *sensible revelation* which he desired to have made to him. His request was 'make me *see* thy glory;' and in the answer to this, v. 22, it is said, 'It shall come to pass, while *my glory* passeth by,' &c., but in the verse before us God says, 'I will make all *my goodness* pass before thee.' It is evident, therefore, that the display of the 'goodness' and the 'glory' is identical, and as the latter implies something addressed to the senses, so also does the former. We infer then that the leading idea conveyed by the term טוב *goodness* in the connexion is that of something superlatively *fair*, *beautiful*, *exquisite*, *excellent*, *splendid*—whatever in fine could enter the conception of the most transcendent and glorious *visible* display which the Deity could make of himself to human vision. At the same time, it must be granted that the mental transition from this

grosser sense of the term 'goodness,' in its present connexion, to that of the combination of *moral qualities* so denominated, is easy and natural, and almost necessary. The most gorgeous and dazzling exhibition of a merely *sensible glory* would leave the mind unsatisfied, except so far as it could be regarded as a kind of outward reflection of mental and moral attributes of corresponding character. In like manner, the external forms of beauty in the works both of nature and art produce a powerful effect upon us only as we see reflected in them the emanations of intellectual and moral properties.

We doubt not, therefore, that there was in these words of Jehovah a latent implication, that the exhibition about to be made to his servant should involve something *more* than a splendid phenomenon addressed to the outward eye. A glorious though partial disclosure should indeed be made to his sight; but he should withal be enabled by means of a supernatural illumination to pierce beyond the sensuous imagery, and comprehend its interior meaning. He should have a mental perception of those divine perfections which were so illustriously displayed in connexion with the sublime spectacle of the Shekinah, and the objects for which it was granted to the chosen people. The record of the *facts*, as given in the ensuing chapter, show conclusively that this is the true import of the declaration before us.—¶ *I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee.* Heb. קראתי בשם יהוה לפניך *karathi beshēm Yehovah lepanēka*, *I will call in the name of Jehovah before thee.* The sense is no doubt substantially given in our version, viz., that he would proclaim the name, or in other words would declare the nature, the character, which was always to be associated in their minds with the august denomination, יְהוָה. He would make it known as implying or carrying with



20 And he said, Thou canst not see my face: for ° there shall no man see me and live.

° Gen. 32. 30. Deut. 5. 24. Judg. 6. 22 & 13. 22. Isai. 6. 5. Rev. 1. 16, 17. See ch. 24. 10.

it the exercise of a holy sovereignty in the bestowment of grace and mercy upon such objects as to him seemed good. The meaning therefore is ; ' I will proclaim myself in passing by thee as the Lord whose prerogative it is to be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and to have mercy upon whom I will have mercy. This shall be the substance of what I will proclaim respecting the import of that great and fearful name.' The clause thus understood is therefore a mere brief compend of the more expanded declaration, ch. 34. 6, 7. It is to be observed, however, that some critics take these words simply as yielding a reason for compliance with Moses' request. As such a supernatural manifestation of himself to any person was a special favor on the part of Jehovah, to which no one could lay claim as a right ; therefore the scope of the clause they think is to preclude any objection to his thus distinguishing Moses rather than any other of the Israelites, or the Israelites themselves, rather than any other nation. With them accordingly the ' and ' is equivalent to ' for . ' ' I will make all my goodness to pass before thee, &c., for it is my prerogative to show favors of this kind to whomsoever I will.' For ourselves we prefer the former interpretation.

20. *Thou canst not see my face, &c.* That is, thou canst not *fully* and *adequately* see ; thou canst not, in thy mortal state, receive the full unclouded blaze of glory which constitutes the visible symbol of my face or presence. It is remarkable that one of the Rabbinical writers speaks thus upon the text before us ; ' Of that divine glory mentioned in the Scriptures, there is one degree

21 And the Lord said, Behold *there is* a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock :

22 And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I

which the eyes of the prophets were able to explore ; another which all the Israelites saw, as the cloud and consuming fire ; the third is so bright and so dazzling, that no mortal is able to comprehend it ; but should any one venture to look on it, his whole frame would be dissolved.' *R. Jehudah, Sepher Cosri*, P. 4. § 9. In such inconceivable splendor is the divine Majesty revealed to the inhabitants of the celestial world, where he is said to ' dwell in the light which no man can approach unto '—an intimation which was probably suggested to the mind of Paul by the very incident we are now considering. That Moses had previously been favored, *in some degree*, with the vision of God's face in the bright cloud of the Presence, is clear from v. 11, where it is expressly said that ' the Lord spake unto Moses *face to face*, as a man speaketh unto his friend.' But that was a limited degree of disclosure compared with that which he now sought, and of which the Most High predicates the impossibility of granting it. The implication is obvious that the display of that uncreated splendor which pertained to Christ as the ' brightness of the Father's glory,' would be altogether too overpowering for a tenant of flesh, and could be accorded only to those who were translated into the world of light. At the scene of the Savior's transfiguration on the mount, some measure of this glory was displayed, but even then we have reason to believe it was a mitigated manifestation, or the powers of life in the disciples would have been utterly extinguished. It is only in a future state, when this mortal shall put on immor-

will put thee <sup>p</sup>in a cleft of the rock; and will <sup>q</sup>cover thee with my hand while I pass by :

<sup>p</sup> Isai. 2. 21. <sup>q</sup> Ps. 91. 1, 4.

tality, that the desire which prompted Moses' petition can be gratified. Then, if his, 'we shall see him as he is,' without a medium and without a cloud.

—¶ *There shall no man see me, and live.* Or perhaps more literally, 'there shall no man see me, and *be alive*;' this vision is impossible to men in their present state of existence; they must first pass through death, or be translated, before they are capable of beholding it. This sense is somewhat

*milder* than the common one, as it removes the idea of *arbitrary destructiveness* from the expression, and substitutes that of *intrinsic*, or perhaps we may say, *physical impossibility*. At the same time it is unquestionable, that it was the received opinion among the ancient Israelites, which no one can show to have been false, that a full view of the divine glory would at once be fatal to the beholder. Comp. Gen.

16. 13. Judg. 6. 22, 23, and 13. 22. And it is somewhat confirmatory of this that when the Shekinah, or divine glory, filled the tabernacle, Ex. 40. 35, Moses was not able to enter into it, i. e. he could not make the attempt with safety to his life. So also afterwards at the dedication of the temple, 2 Chron. 7. 1, 2, it is said, 'The glory of the Lord filled the house, and the priests could not enter into the house, because the glory of the Lord had filled the Lord's house.'

The difficulty in both cases was the same. The glory was too splendid for human endurance. God must 'hold back the face of his throne,' if he would spare the visual and vital powers of feeble worms. Even the partial display that was made to Paul on his way to Damascus struck him with a blindness of some days continuance. But in heaven

23 And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall <sup>r</sup>not be seen.

<sup>r</sup> ver. 20. John 1. 18.

the difficulty is removed. It is the blessed prerogative of the tenants of that world of light, that they are prepared to enjoy what is prepared to be enjoyed. Rev. 22. 4, 'His servants shall *see his face*.'

21—23. *And the Lord said, Behold, there is a place by me,* &c. It is clear that God was not displeased with the petition of his servant. He saw that it was not prompted by an idle curiosity or a vain presumption, but from a fervent desire to enjoy more of the brightness of his presence. He was willing, therefore, to comply with it as far as would be either safe or profitable for him. But in order to this the imbecility of his nature required that certain precautions should be adopted. The splendor of a full display of his glory would be wholly insufferable, and means must be resorted to to soften and mitigate the manifestation so that his feeble powers would be able to bear it. Accordingly he informs him that there is a rocky recess in some part of the mount near where the Cloud was abiding, into which he should enter, and after being still farther overshadowed by the divine hand, (Arab. 'I will overshadow thee with my cloud') should be permitted to behold a transient glimpse of the overpowering brightness of Jehovah. But even this was not to be a view of his *face*. The interposing medium was to screen the vision from his sight till it had passed by, and then he was to look upon it and behold his *back parts*, as one might behold the back of a royal personage as he moved along in majestic state in front of his train. Arab. 'I will then take away my cloud, that thou mayst see the back parts of my Angel, for his face is not to be

seen.' The language of Elihu in Job, ch. 36. 32, is peculiarly applicable to this part of the narrative; 'With clouds he covereth the light, and commandeth it not to shine, by the cloud that cometh betwixt.' The language of the description is necessarily borrowed from human things, though we see no reason to doubt that it was as literally correct as the nature of the case would allow. Even if it be granted that Omnipotence *could* so have softened the *front aspect* of the glory as to make it tolerable to Moses' eyes, and displayed it in a stationary-form without passing by, yet nothing could be more expressive than the mode adopted to convey the intimation, that while a *lower* degree of disclosure could be made to him, a *higher* could not. This would be still more indubitable from the effect produced. Partial and moderated as the revelation was, yet the face of Moses caught a supernatural lustre from the glory as it passed, which remained with him when he came down from the mount, and which was so overpowering to the beholders that, from a regard to their weakness, he veiled himself before them. If then a more *reflected* radiance from the countenance of Moses, and that too coming from the *hinder part* of the resplendent phenonemon, was so transcendantly glorious, what must have been the effect of the unclouded light of Jehovah's *face*! Yet let us repeat in reference to this whole gracious manifestation, that the glory beheld was unquestionably the glory of Christ. Nor are we prepared to deny that a resplendent human form, preintimative of the Divine Man, Christ Jesus, was vaguely presented to his view. At any rate we would have the following passage attentively considered in this connexion, Num. 12. 6—8, 'And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a

dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; *and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold.*' What can be meant by Moses' beholding 'the similitude of the Lord' but his being favored with the display here recorded? And what is the similitude of the Lord but he who is the 'brightness of the Father's glory and the *express image* of his person.' At the same time it was not, we believe, a view of Christ's glory in his state of humiliation and suffering, as the man of sorrows, that was accorded to Moses, but of the glory of his post-resurrection state of exaltation and honor, when he shall be revealed from heaven in a splendor that shall darken the light of the sun. For a somewhat more adequate view of this state we must have recourse to the scene of the Savior's transfiguration, when a cloud also overshadowed the disciples, as it doubtless did Moses; and when Moses and Elias were present in glorified forms, probably because they had both in the very same place been favored with a remarkable manifestation of the Deity, a coincidence by the way that has generally been overlooked, but about which there can be no doubt. As to Moses, the present narrative is sufficiently explicit, and as to Elijah we are told, 1 Kings, 19. 8—11, that he arose and went in the strength of his supernatural supply of food 'forty days and forty nights unto Horeb, the mount of God. And he came thither unto a cave and lodged there.' This was probably the same cave into which Moses was made to enter on the present occasion. Elijah, however, was commanded to go forth, and to stand upon the mount before the Lord; 'And behold, the Lord *passed by*,' as he had done in the case of Moses, though in a different mode of manifestation. Still it was a real theophany with which he was favored, and

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

AND the Lord said unto Moses, <sup>a</sup>Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: <sup>b</sup>and I will write upon *these* tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest.

2 And be ready in the morning, and come up in the morning to

<sup>a</sup> ch. 32. 16, 19. Deut. 10. 1. <sup>b</sup> ver. 28. Deut. 10. 2, 4.

one that doubtless had a prospective reference to Christ; so that we can see sufficient reason from these historical facts for Moses and Elijah's appearing at the scene of transfiguration. It was natural that they should be associated with that display of the Savior's glory which was so similar to what they had seen in the days of their flesh. Add to this that Elijah was translated, and in all probability assimilated at once, as the saints will hereafter be, to this very glory.

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

1. *And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee, &c.* Heb. פסל לך *pesal leka*, *hew for thyself*; whereas the former tables, both as to matter and form, were the work of God himself. Ex. 32. 16. The English word 'hew' denotes a rougher process than is legitimately implied by the original, which signifies *to cut with a graving tool, to chisel, to execute a piece of sculpture*. The divine benignity here shows itself ready to renew the covenant which Israel had broken, but at the same time gives a command which indicated that favor was restored with some abatement. God would not allow the facility of pardon to beget a presumptuous levity of spirit or slight apprehension of the evil of sin. Some memento of punishment therefore adheres to the renewed expression of favor. The wound is healed, but a scar remains. The former tables were throughout of divine

Mount Sinai, and present thyself there to me <sup>c</sup>in the top of the mount.

3 And no man shall <sup>d</sup>come up with thee, neither let any man be seen throughout all the mount: neither let the flocks nor herds feed before that mount.

<sup>c</sup> chap. 19. 20. & 24. 12. <sup>d</sup> ch. 19. 12, 13, 21.

workmanship, both the material and the writing; in the present, the writing only. But it is enough if the writing be his; for that is the life of the covenant. The circumstance affords well grounded comfort if we are touched with genuine compunction after having proved unfaithful to our Christian vows. God is willing to renew the covenant, if we devoutly desire the favor at his hands. He is still virtually saying, 'I will write upon those (fleshly) tables (of the heart) the words that were in the first tables (in the state of innocency) which thou brakest (in the fall of Adam).'

2, 3. *Come up in the morning unto mount Sinai, and present thyself there to me.* Heb. נצבת לי שם *nitz-tzabta li sham*, *stand for me there*. That is, take your station there and await my coming down, as appears from v. 5. It would seem therefore that by 'the top of the mount' is not meant absolutely the highest summit, but some elevated point in the neighborhood of the summit. For as the cloud of the Shekinah usually abode on the apex of the mount, and yet in v. 5, is said to have 'descended,' the inference is inevitable that Moses was to station himself at a point somewhat *below* the topmost brow of the mountain. Here he was to stand alone, and the flocks and herds were forbidden to approach the base of the mount, in order that the law might be a second time received with the solemnity and sanctity which marked its first delivery. The

4 ¶ And he hewed two tables of stone, like unto the first; and Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto mount Sinai, as the LORD had commanded him, and took in his hand the two tables of stone.

5 And the LORD descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and <sup>e</sup>proclaimed the name of the LORD.

6 And the LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, The LORD, The LORD <sup>f</sup>God, merciful and gra-

<sup>e</sup> ch. 33. 19. Numb. 14. 17. <sup>f</sup> Numb. 14. 18. 2 Chren. 30. 9. Neh. 9. 17. Ps. 86. 15. & 103. 8. & 111. 4. & 112. 4. & 116. 5. & 145. 8. Joel 2. 13.

whole transaction was to be so ordered as to impress the congregation with an awful sense of the holiness of Jehovah, and of their own unworthiness, and with a deep conviction that it was a matter of no trifling moment thus to have subjected the Most High to the necessity of *deuteronomising*, as we may say, the law of the ten commandments.

4. *And Moses rose up early in the morning, &c.* To show his alacrity and zeal in yielding obedience to the divine command. 'The morning is, perhaps, as good a friend to the *graces* as it is to the *muses*.' Henry.—¶ *And took in his hand the two tables of stone.* Which it is consequently to be inferred were thin and light and of no very great dimensions. This is also to be inferred from their having been deposited in the ark, which was three feet nine inches in length, by two feet three inches in breadth. We can easily conceive what an impression it must have conveyed to the people of the dignity of the law to see these smooth and empty tables returned from the mount re-inscribed with the ten commandments, when they well knew that no graving-tool or other instrument was there to be found with which Moses could have executed the work. They would of course refer it

cious, long-suffering, and abundant in <sup>g</sup>goodness and <sup>h</sup>truth,

7 <sup>i</sup>Keeping mercy for thousands, <sup>k</sup>forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and <sup>l</sup>that will by no means clear *the guilty*; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth *generation*.

<sup>g</sup> Ps. 31. 19. Rom. 2. 4. <sup>h</sup> Ps. 57. 10. & 103. 4. <sup>i</sup> ch. 20. 6. Deut. 5. 10. Ps. 86. 15. Jer. 32. 18. Dan. 9. 4. <sup>k</sup> Ps. 103. 3. & 130. 4. Dan. 9. 9. Eph. 4. 32. <sup>l</sup> John 1. 9. <sup>1</sup> ch. 23. 7, 21. Josh. 24. 19. Job. 10. 14. Mich. 6. 11. Nah. 1. 3.

at once not to the act of man, but to the finger of God; and if he had *written* it, they might be sure that he would *maintain* it.

5. *And the Lord descended in the cloud.* The cloud's descending was the Lord's descending. According to the usage so frequently adverted to in previous Notes, the title of Jehovah is applied to the symbol by which he was represented. Not that the cloud was an arbitrary and empty emblem of a distant God, but the divine presence was most intimately, though mysteriously, united with it, so that for all designed purposes it was God manifest to the outward senses—a shadow and preintimation of 'God (subsequently) manifest in the flesh.' Arab. 'And the Angel of God appeared in the clouds, and his Light (or Splendor) stood with him there.' The Most High descended in this manner in fulfilment of his promise before made, ch. 33. 19—23, and accordingly proclaimed, in an audible voice, his NAME, that is, the character and perfections denoted by his name.

6, 7. *And the Lord passed by, &c.* Chal. 'And the Lord made his Shekinah to pass before his face.' Arab. 'And when the Angel of God passed before him,' &c. The Hebrew writers, there-

fore, comparing this passage with Ex. 33. 19, 22, say, 'The Shekinah, or Divine Majesty, called I, passed by;' thus denoting that they regarded the Shekinah as mysteriously one with the Father. But what was the import of the proclamation?—¶ *The Lord, the Lord God, gracious and merciful, &c.* The reader who may chance to be familiar with the Hebrew will at once perceive that our mode of interpunction in this passage does not agree with that of the original. The proper reading is the following, 'And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed Jehovah, Jehovah: God, merciful and gracious,' &c. The august title 'Jehovah' is reduplicated by way of emphasis, as that pre-eminent designation which was designed to come home to the soul with the utmost fulness of awful import. To this the name 'God' (אֱלֹהִים *il*) is subjoined, of which the leading idea is that of *strength, might, potency*, and which in this connexion would naturally convey the idea of *all-sufficient protection* to all his people and of *formidableness* to all their enemies. 'He is *mighty in strength*; who hath hardened himself against him, and prospered?' This proclamation of his name as *almighty* would serve as a very suitable preface to the announcement of his *moral attributes* just about to follow; for it becomes us to think and to speak even of his grace and goodness in a spirit of holy awe, as deeply conscious how fearful and terrible is that Being who wields *omnipotence*. His mercies are not the mercies of a frail feeble creature like ourselves, but of a God of infinite resources; and they are on this account unspeakably endeared to the subjects of them. 'His *greatness and goodness* illustrate and set off each other. That the terror of his greatness may not make us afraid, we are told how *good* he is; and that we may not presume upon his *goodness*, we are told how *great* he is.' Henry.—The attributes

that follow require to be considered a little more in detail.—¶ *Merciful* Heb. רַחוּם *raham*. The import of the term is that of *tenderly kind, pitiful, compassionate*, whence the term רַחֲמִים *rahamim*, *bowels of mercies or compassions*, Gen. 43. 14. This is that perfection of Jehovah's nature with which we, as sinners, have the most immediate and intimate concern, and therefore it very properly stands first in this enumeration. It is this that constitutes the moving spring in the great machinery of benevolence, which is to be seen in the scheme of redemption. It is the disposition which prompts to the pity and relief of the miserable; which renders the possessor propense to acts of kindness and clemency, like those of a father to a child, wherever the objects of them are found. It is an attribute of the Godhead which is incessantly celebrated by the inspired writers. The Psalmist, whose pious songs are so instinct with the praises of God, says of him that he is 'plenteous in *mercy*,' speaks again and again of the 'multitude of his *mercies*,' and assures us that his '*tender mercies* are over all his works.' But it is those who live under the gospel who see its brightest displays, nor was it possible for any of the Old Testament saints to speak in such eulogy of it as the apostles Peter and Paul, for example, in the citations which follow; 1 Pet. 1. 3, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his *abundant mercy*, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,' Eph. 2. 4—7, 'But God, who is *rich in mercy*, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus: That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of

his grace in his kindness towards us, through Christ Jesus.'—π *Gracious*. Heb. חַנּוּן *hannun*; from the root חָנַן *hanan*, signifying *to be kindly or graciously affectioned towards a person*. In Scripture usage this term as applied to God and as denoting his dispositions and dealings towards men, carries with it the leading import of *unmerited favor or kindness*. 'We call that חַנּוּנָה *hanninah*,' says Maimonides, 'which we bestow upon any man to whom we owe nothing.' In this sense does God bestow grace upon the sinning children of men. He is rich in the donation of favors to which they have no claim. His abounding benignity triumphs over their ill desert, and causes heaven to be peopled with those who were justly the heirs of hell.—π *Long suffering*. עֵרֶךְ אַפִּים *erek appim*, *long of anger*, or more literally, *long of nostrils*, from the ideal connexion between the passion of anger and its effects in inflating the nostrils. This 'long suffering' on the part of God is the first-fruit of his mercy and grace. He bears long with sinners; he delays the execution of justice; he waits to be gracious in despite of their iniquities. Nothing is more wonderful than the patience of God when we consider the provocations which he continually receives at the hands of the ungodly. How long did he bear with the antediluvian world! What forbearance did he exercise towards the murmuring and rebellious Israelites during their sojourn in the wilderness, and indeed throughout all their generations! Nay, to bring the matter home to ourselves, who is not forced to acknowledge that he is himself a monument of the same long-suffering and tender mercy? Have we not provoked him to anger every day of our lives? Yet to the praise of his patience here we still find ourselves, standing on praying ground, and favored with the offers and opportunities of pardon. Ah, how different would be our lot had he dealt with us

after our sins, or rewarded us according to our iniquities!—π *Abundant in goodness and truth*. Heb. רַב חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת *rab hesed ve-emeth*, *much in goodness, or benignity, and truth*. The idea is that of *exuberant benevolence*. So rich, so bounteous, so multitudinous, are the expressions of the divine favor, that we may be said to be almost overflowed with them. And not only so, not only does his goodness abound above our deserts and above our powers of acknowledgment, but being a God of *truth*, who will not and cannot deceive, we are assured that every promise of further and future good will be strictly fulfilled, and that nothing will prevent the realization of those eternal blessings which he has reserved for them that put their trust in him! 'Faithful is he who hath called us, who also will do it.' He may not indeed in all cases *speedily* accomplish his word. His ways are often directly contrary to those of reason, and a long time elapses, and many difficulties are overcome, but finally his truth comes without fail to a triumphant fulfilment.—π *Keeping mercy for thousands*. Heb. נֹצֵר חֶסֶד *notz'ir hesed*. The original term חֶסֶד *hesed*, *mercy*, here is precisely the same with that which in the preceding clause is rendered 'goodness.' In the former passage, therefore, reference is had to the *plenitude* of the divine mercy, in the present to its *perpetuity*. Chal. 'Keeping goodness to a thousand generations.' God *keeps* or *preserves* mercy by continually showing it in all its various exercises to thousands of sinners in all ages and to the end of time. His *keeping* it implies that it is inexhaustible; that whatever measures of it may yet have been dispensed, an infinite sufficiency still remains behind. He *keeps* it notwithstanding the crying provocations which might move him to cast it away. He *reserves* it for his chosen people through all the days of their unregeneracy; he *keeps* it for his backsliding Davids, and his denying

Peters, against the time in which they shall penitently exclaim, 'I have sinned!' Nay, who can tell but he may have 'kept mercy' for him whose eye is now perusing these pages—kept it year after year unto the present hour? And shall he not accept of it? But let us remember that although this mercy is inexhaustible for those that shall come after us, yet for each of us individually its day has a close. If we embrace it not while the day lasts, the night is not far distant when its door will be shut against us for ever.—

¶ *Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.* Heb. נָשָׂא עֲוֹן וּפְשָׁעַ וְהַטְּאָה *nosë avon vapesha vehattaah, taking or bearing away* (i. e. forgiving) *iniquity, trespass, and sin.* This is the climax of the present proclamation of the divine perfections. *Pardoning* mercy is specified, not only because it is in this form that the glory of this attribute pre-eminently shines, but because it is pardoning mercy that opens the way for the exercise of all other mercy. It was all important therefore for the consolation of sinners, that this peculiar aspect of the divine goodness should be distinctly displayed. Hence we find the terms expressive of the sins forgiven so remarkably varied and multiplied, in order to imply that *all sorts and degrees* of offences come within the scope of its benign operation. In order then that our hearts may be duly affected by this declaration, let us refer both to history and to experience for a confirmation of its truth. See in the sacred records what multiplied acts and what aggravated forms of iniquity the divine clemency has graciously passed by! What sins before conversion! what sins after conversion! And then if we attempt, each for himself to enumerate his own transgressions, will they not be found more in number than the sands on the sea-shore, and sufficient, if visited according to their desert, to overwhelm the soul at

once in perdition! Yet if believers in Christ these our sins are all forgiven! How many iniquities then is God continually pardoning in every quarter of the globe! What an idea does it give of the divine indulgence to think that his remissions keep pace with our provocations!—¶ *That will by no means clear the guilty.* Heb. נִקְּה לֹא יִנְקְהוּ *nakküh lo yenakküh, that clearing will not clear*; i. e. acquit, absolve, hold guiltless. This is a clause of exceedingly difficult interpretation, as will be evident from the diversity of ancient renderings, which we give before attempting to settle the genuine sense. Chal. 'Sparing those who are converted to his law, and not justifying those who are not converted.' Gr. *καὶ οὐ καθαρίζει τὸν ἐνοχόν*, *and will not purify the guilty.* Arab. 'Who justifies and is not justified.' Sam. 'With whom the innocent shall not be innocent.' Vulg. 'And no person is innocent by or of himself before thee,' which gives a sound theological sense, viz., that no man can make an atonement for his own sins, or purify his own heart; inasmuch as all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. But whether this is the idea intended to be conveyed in this passage, is another question. Jerus. Targ. 'He will not clear sinners in the day of the great judgment.' Most of these versions yield substantially, though not very explicitly, the sense of ours; and yet it is certain that the language of the English text at first blush seems to stand at least in verbal contrariety to that of the preceding declaration; for how can it be said that God 'forgiveth iniquity, transgression, and sin,' if at the same time 'he will by no means clear the guilty?' If it were possible, therefore, on legitimate grounds, to assign to the words a sense which should more nearly accord with the drift of the foregoing expressions, it would seem to give more unity of import to the whole address. This we



think may be very easily done without doing the least violence to the text, or slurring over, with some critics, the intimation doubtless intended to be conveyed, that God is a God of justice as well as a God of mercy. From comparing this form of expression with the usus loquendi in other cases, we are satisfied that the true rendering is, 'who will not wholly, entirely, altogether clear;' i.e. who, although merciful and gracious in his dispositions, strongly inclined to forgive, and actually forgiving in countless cases and abundant measure, is yet not unmindful of the claims of justice. He will not always suffer even the pardoned sinner to escape with entire impunity. He will mingle so much of the penal in his dealings as to evince that his clemency is not to be presumed upon. Accordingly a proof of this would be seen in his visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and their descendants unto several generations; for this clause is to be taken in immediate connexion with what goes before, and as a kind of complement to its sense. That this is philologically the true import of the phrase 'clearing will not clear,' the following parallel citations we think will put beyond question. Is. 30. 19, 'For the people shall dwell at Zion in Jerusalem; *thou shalt weep no more* (בָּכָה לֹא תִבְכִּי *bako lo thibkah, weeping thou shalt not weep*). The meaning, according to Gesenius, is, not that their weeping should utterly and absolutely cease, but that they should not incessantly weep; they should not weep as if they had nothing to do *but* to weep; though weeping had hitherto been prevailingly their lot, yet it should not always continue so. They should have a respite and remission to the effusion of their tears. So also still more pertinently, Jer. 25. 29, 'For lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and *should ye be utterly unpunished* (הִנָּקְהָ הַנִּקְהָ *hinnakēh tin-*

*naku, clearing should ye be cleared?*)?' That is, should ye be entirely and altogether exempted? Jer. 30. 11, 'Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and *will not leave thee altogether unpunished* (נִקְהָ לֹא נִקְהָ אֶתְּךָ *nakkēh lo anekkeka, clearing I will not clear thee*). In this case the parallelism is perfect. If the version—'will not leave thee altogether unpunished'—is correct in the one case, why should not *precisely the same words*—with only the personal variation—be rendered in the present passage, 'I will not utterly or altogether acquit, absolve, exempt from punishment?' So also Jer. 49. 12, 'Behold, they whose judgment was not to drink of the cup, have assuredly drunken; and art thou he *who shall go altogether unpunished* (הִנָּקְהָ הַנִּקְהָ *hu nakoh tinnakēh, who shall clearing be cleared?*)?' Where the sense given in our translation is undoubtedly correct. On the whole, therefore, there seems no room to question that God intended in these words to intimate, that the preceding declaration of a readiness to forgive all manner of transgression was not to be understood in so absolute and unqualified a sense as to preclude all ideas of penal justice. Though prone to pardon, yet it was to be known that he could and would punish, whenever his wisdom saw that the occasion required, even in those cases where, on the whole, his mercy was predominant. Thus in the case of David, while his great sin was forgiven, and matter of praise and thanksgiving throughout eternity administered to him, yet in 'clearing he was not wholly cleared.' A series of chastisements and afflictions followed him to his dying day, that he might learn how bitter and evil a thing it was to turn away from God as he had rashly done. And so in multitudes of other instances. Let us then beware that we do not lose our-

8 And Moses made haste, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped.

9 And he said, If now I have found grace in thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray thee, go

<sup>m</sup> ch. 4. 31. <sup>n</sup> ch. 33. 15, 16.

selves and endanger our souls in erroneous and unauthorized views of the pardoning mercy of the Most High. Though inclined to forgive and to blot out the multitudinous transgressions of his sinful creatures, yet he would never have them lose sight of the fact, that no one can absolutely promise himself impunity in doing wrong.—¶ *Visiting the iniquity of the fathers.* An ample exposition of the drift of this language has already been given in the Note on Ex. 20. 5. The Chal. supplies what is necessarily to be understood in this connexion; 'Visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, and the children's children of the wicked, to the third and fourth generation.' So also the Targ. Jerus. 'Remembering the sins of the wicked fathers upon the rebellious sons, unto the third generation and the fourth generation.'

8, 9. *And Moses made haste, and bowed, &c.* No doubt the effect of this overpowering display at once upon the senses and the soul of Moses was a kind of rapture, which while it left him in the possession of his reason, still prompted him with the utmost expedition suitably to acknowledge and improve the amazing manifestation of mercy now vouchsafed to him. He not only falls down in prostrate adoration on the earth, but seizes the encouraging words from the mouth of the Lord, and pleads them as a fresh argument for the forgiveness of Israel, and the continuance of his presence among them.—¶ *O Lord, let my Lord, I pray thee, go among us.* Chal. 'Let I pray thee, the Shekinah of the Lord go among us.' Arab. 'Let thine Angel walk among us.' The

among us (for <sup>o</sup> it is a stiff-necked people), and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for <sup>p</sup> thine inheritance.

<sup>o</sup> ch. 33. 3. <sup>p</sup> Deut. 32. 9. Ps. 28. 9. & 33. 12. & 78. 62. & 94. 14. Jer. 10. 16. Zech. 2. 12.

recent discovery made to him of what was involved in the symbol redoubled his anxiety as to its continuance among them. Hence the repetition of the request. It should be remarked that in the address the original is not יהוה *Yehovah*, but אֲדֹנָי *adonai*, which is a term of less significant but perhaps in this relation of more endearing import, and approaching more nearly to the sense of *Master*. It is more properly a term applicable to a *restricted lordship*, founded upon a peculiar relation, subsisting by covenant or some special mode of acquisition, between the ruler and the ruled. The fact that Israel were *Yehovah's* 'inheritance' would make him their אֲדֹנָי *adonai*, while the fact that they were his *creatures* would make him their יהוה *Yehovah*. So in the New Testament phrase, 2 Pet. 2. 1, 'denying the Lord that bought them,' the original is δεσποτὴς *despotes* instead of κύριος *kurios*, the usual word for *Lord* and the common translation of יהוה *Yehovah*; implying that their denial was the denial of a *federative* or *rectoral* lord and governor, who had acquired a right, growing out of covenant or pactional relations, to their homage and loyalty. They had *professed*, by assuming the Christian name, to belong to the number of those whom Christ had *bought*, *possessed*, or *inherited*, and consequently their defection was a *treasonable outrage* upon their most sacred obligations. To say that *true Christians* should become false teachers and bring in damnable heresies and deny the Lord who had *really* bought them with his blood and endowed them with his spirit, and thus bring *swift destruc-*

10 ¶ And he said, Behold qI make a covenant: before all thy people I will rdo marvels, such as have not been done in all the

q Deut. 5. 2. & 29. 12, 14. r Deut. 4. 32. 2 Sam. 7. 23. Ps. 77. 14. & 78. 12. & 147. 20.

tion upon themselves, seems scarcely a supposable mode of speech. But it would be very applicable to those who were only *professedly* Christians, and proved recreant to their assumed character.—¶ *For it is a stiff-necked people.* Heb. *כִּי אִם קֶשֶׁה עֶרְףְּ הוּא* *ki am keshēh oreph hu*, which may with equal propriety be rendered, 'THOUGH *this be a people hard of neck.*' Notwithstanding they have proved so refractory and rebellious, that I scarcely know how to bespeak thy favor for them, yet pardon their iniquity and forsake them not. Continue to vouchsafe to them the tokens of thy presence.' See on Gen. 8. 21.—¶ *Take us for thine inheritance.* Heb. *נִחַלְתָּנוּ* *nehaltanu*, *inherit or possess thou us.* Gr. *εσομεθα σοι*, *we shall be to thee*, i. e. *thine.* Arab. 'Elect us.' The Targ. Jon., which is followed by Le Clerc, gives a causative sense to the term, 'Make us to inherit the land which thou didst promise to our fathers, that thou mayst not exchange us for another people.' The common rendering, however, is more simple, and such as finds an echo in numerous passages like the following; Deut. 32. 9, 'The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the *lot of his inheritance.*' Ps. 28. 9, 'Save thy people, and bless thine *inheritance.*' Ps. 33. 12, 'Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom *he hath chosen for his own inheritance.*' Ps. 78. 62, 'He gave his people over also unto the sword; and was wroth with *his inheritance.*' The favors which Moses bespeaks in this verse are indeed the favors which God already explicitly promised to grant, and yet he here renews his supplication for them with redoubled earn-

earth, nor in any nation: and all the people among which thou *art* shall see the work of the LORD: for it is s a terrible thing that I will do with thee.

s Deut. 10. 21. Ps. 145. 6. Isai. 64. 3.

estness; thus teaching us that the certainty of receiving good at the hand of the Lord should never relax, but always quicken, our prayers and endeavors to secure it.

10. *Behold I make a covenant, &c.* In such language is God pleased to signify his acceptance of and compliance with the prayer of Moses. In that prayer he had virtually pleaded with God the verification of his own words respecting his own attributes, as a God forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin. He beseeches him to remember and perform all the good he had promised to the chosen race, unworthy as they were, and instead of casting them off, to confirm them as his own inheritance, his peculiar treasure, among the nations of the earth. To this prayer the Lord not only lends a favoring and consenting ear, but in order to give him the fullest possible assurance, he renews his promise under the form of a covenant engagement, than which nothing could be conceived more binding. Infinite veracity seems disposed to put itself under additional obligations. Indeed upon an attentive view of the whole context we can scarcely consider it as any thing short of an actual and formal renewal of the covenant which the people had broken, and the blessings of which they had forfeited by their late transgression. Although the word 'covenant' is repeatedly used by the sacred writers in the sense of *solemn promise, purpose, pledge, stipulation*, announced by one party only, yet here it seems to imply something *mutual*, as God goes on to state in the first place what he himself engages to do, and then to command what he would

11 †Observe thou that which I command thee this day: Behold, †I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite.

12 \*Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for †a snare in the midst of thee:

13 But ye shall †destroy their

† Deut. 5. 32. & 6. 3, 25. & 12. 28, 32. & 28. 1. † ch. 33. 2. \* ch. 23. 32. Deut. 7. 2. Judg. 2. 2. † ch. 23. 33. † ch. 23. 24. Deut. 12. 3. Judg. 2. 2.

have them, on their part, observe; in which he repeats in fact the leading points that formed the conditions of the former national compact. Compare chapters twenty-three and twenty-four.

—† *Before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done.*

Heb. נִפְלְאוֹת אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִבְרְאוּ *niphlaoth asher lo nibreü, marvellous things which have not been created.*

The phraseology affords another instance of that peculiar use of the Hebrew term for *create* which we have so fully illustrated in our Note on Gen. 1. 1. The allusion is doubtless to the wonderful display of power which marked the introduction of Israel into the promised land, and their subsequent series of conquests, such as the dividing the waters of Jordan, the causing the walls of Jericho to fall down, making the sun and moon to stand still, &c., all which would amount to precisely that *marvellous and glorious discrimination* for which Moses had prayed, Ex. 33. 16, where the original verb נִפְלְאוֹת *niphlinu* is from the same root with נִפְלְאוֹת *niphlaöth, marvels*, in the passage before us.

—† *All the people among which thou art.* That is, all thine own people; the nation of Israel in contradistinction from the heathen races round about.—† *It is a terrible thing that I*

altars, break their images, and † cut down their groves:

14 For thou shalt worship, † no other god: for the LORD, whose † name is Jealous, is a † jealous God:

15 † Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they † go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and † one † call thee, and thou † eat of his sacrifice;

† Deut. 7. 5. & 12. 2. Judg. 6. 25. 2 Kings 18. 4. & 23. 14. 2 Chron. 31. 1. & 34. 3, 4. † ch. 20. 3. 5. † So Isai. 9. 6. & 57. 15. † ch. 20. 5. † ver. 12. † Deut. 31. 16. Judg. 2. 17. Jer. 3. 9. Ezek. 6. 9. † Numb. 25. 2. 1 Cor 10. 27. † Ps. 106. 28. 1 Cor. 8. 4, 7, 10.

*will do with thee.* Heb. עִמָּךְ *immeke.* That is, not *towards* thee, but in thy sight, in thy presence, and, as it were, in conjunction with thee; making thee not only a witness, but also in some sense a medium, an instrumental agent. The words seem to be spoken to Moses personally.

11. *Observe thou that which I command thee this day.* What follows from this verse to the end of v. 26, is to be considered as a collection of the most prominent precepts, forming the conditions of the covenant on the part of the people. But before reciting them God very briefly repeats the substance of his own engagement, as a motive to stimulate them to the performance of theirs, to wit, that he would drive out before them the devoted nations, and put them in triumphant possession of the promised land. As if he should say, 'You see what I have pledged myself to do; now let me see that you will not be wanting in what I require of you.'

12—17. *Take heed to thyself, &c.* The grand prohibition which God saw to be most needful for his people was that against idolatry; and this accordingly occupies the series of verses from the 12th to the 17th. The interdiction of a covenant with the inhabitants of

16 And thou take of <sup>i</sup>their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters <sup>k</sup>go a whoring after their gods,

<sup>i</sup> Deut. 7. 3. 1 Kings 11. 2. Ezra 9. 2. Neh. 13. 25. <sup>k</sup> Numb. 25. 1, 2. 1 Kings 11. 4.

the land, to which they were going; was but the planting of a safeguard around the main precept. It was scarcely possible that they should form treaties and alliances of any kind with those idolatrous nations without being inveigled into a participation of their sin. Such connexions would be sure to be a snare to them, and how reasonable was it that they should be forbidden to make peace with those with whom God was making war? So far indeed from tolerating these abominations, they were to hold themselves bound utterly to destroy all their altars, images, and groves, and as far as in them lay to efface every vestige of their foul and odious worship. For this a reason full of awful import is given;—*¶ For the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God.* That is, whose *nature* is jealous; who can bear no rival. The *names* of God designate his attributes. This is mentioned here with peculiar propriety. The covenant made with Israel was virtually a marriage-covenant, and consequently idolatry was adultery. Every approach to this sin, therefore, would be sure to provoke him to jealousy, just as the infidelity of a wife stirs up the same passion in the bosom of the injured husband. We are not indeed to transfer in our minds human passions to the bosom of the Deity; but the Scriptures, as we have before remarked, are constructed on the plan of ascribing the attributes of humanity to God, because he often *acts* in his dealings with men *as they act* when under the influence of certain passions. To convey, therefore, an intelligible idea, the passions themselves are affirmed of God when his conduct resembles the effect of those im-

and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods.

17 <sup>i</sup>Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.

<sup>i</sup> ch. 32. 8. Lev. 19. 4.

pulses in men. 'Jealousy,' says Solomon, Prov. 6. 34, 35, 'is the rage of a man; therefore he will not spare in the day of vengeance; he will not regard any ransom, neither will he rest content though thou givest many gifts.' This is human jealousy. What is said of divine? Deut. 32. 21—23, 'They have moved me to jealousy; and a fire is kindled in mine anger, and it shall burn to the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them, and will spend mine arrows upon them.' Compare Nahum. 1. 2.—*¶ And one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice.* This the apostle informs us, 1 Cor. 10. 20, 21, was equivalent in the sight of God to one's professing himself to be of the idolatrous communion which feasted upon the sacrifices of their demon-gods. The reason of this is obvious. When the covenant people feasted upon a sacrifice, the meat was supposed to be God's, and to be set upon his table. The feasters were accordingly considered as his guests, entertained at his table in token of reconciliation and friendship. This act confirmed in the strongest possible manner the covenant relation supposed to exist between the parties. Consequently, all those who ate of the sacrifices offered to *other gods*, virtually professed themselves thereby to be the worshippers and servants of such false deities, which they could not be without renouncing the worship and service of the true God. See Note on Ex. 27. 4, 5. The subsequent history, Num. 25. 1—3, shows but too clearly how intimate is the connexion between the sins here mentioned, and how needful, though unavail-

18 ¶ The feast of <sup>m</sup> unleavened bread shalt thou keep. Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, as I commanded thee, in the time of the month Abib: for in the <sup>n</sup> month Abib thou camest out from Egypt.

19 ° All that openeth the matrix is mine: and every firstling among thy cattle, *whether* ox or sheep, *that is male*.

<sup>m</sup> ch. 12. 15. & 23. 15. <sup>n</sup> ch. 13. 4. ° ch. 13. 2, 12. & 22. 29. Ezek. 44. 30. Luke 2. 23.

ing, was the caution now administered; 'And Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. *And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods:* and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods. And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor: and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel.' Compare also the melancholy case of Solomon, 1 Kings, 11. 1—10.

18. *The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep.* See Notes on Ex. 12. 15, 16.—13. 6, 7.—23. 15. The following precepts, which have been for the most part explained in the Notes on ch. 23. 1—17, relate to such points of their religion as were peculiar to it, and such as they would be most apt to neglect; not such as in themselves and morally considered were of the greatest importance.

19. *All that openeth the matrix, &c.* See Notes on Ex. 13. 2, 12.—22. 29.

20. *The firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb.* That is, with a living lamb, either of the sheep or goat, which was to be given to the priest, Num. 18. 15. Comp. Ex. 13. 13. On this precept the Hebrew writers say, 'It might be redeemed with a lamb, whether male or female, unblemished or blemished, small or great. If a man have no lamb to redeem it with, he may redeem it with the value of it, and give

20 But <sup>p</sup> the firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb: and if thou redeem *him* not, then shalt thou break his neck. All the first-born of thy sons thou shalt redeem. And none shall appear before me <sup>q</sup> empty.

21 ¶ <sup>r</sup> Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing-time and in harvest thou shalt rest.

<sup>p</sup> ch. 13. 13. Numb. 18. 15. <sup>q</sup> ch. 23. 15. Deut. 16. 16. 1 Sam. 9. 7, 8. 2 Sam. 24. 24. <sup>r</sup> ch. 20. 9. & 23. 12. & 35. 2. Deut. 5. 12, 13. Luke 13. 14.

the price to the priest. The law commandeth not a lamb to make it heavier upon him, but lighter. For if he have the firstling of an ass which is worth ten shekels, he may redeem it with a lamb worth a quarter of a shekel.' Ainsworth.

21. *In earing-time and in harvest shalt thou rest.* That is, in the busiest seasons of the year, the seasons of ploughing and sowing and harvesting. They were not to consider the urgency of business as affording a sufficient excuse for neglecting the religious observance of the day. 'This commandment is worthy of especial note. Many break the Sabbath on the pretence of absolute necessity, because, if in harvest time, the weather happens to be what is called *bad*, and the Sabbath day be *fair* and *fine*, they judge it perfectly lawful to employ that day in endeavoring to save the fruits of the field, and think that the goodness of the day is an indication from providence that it should be thus employed. But is not the command above pointed directly against this? I have known this law often broken on this pretence, and have never been able to discover a single instance, where the persons who acted thus succeeded one whit better than their more conscientious neighbors, who availed themselves of no such favorable circumstances, being deter-

22 ¶ \* And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the first-fruits of wheat-harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end.

23 ¶ † Thrice in the year shall all your men-children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel.

<sup>s</sup> ch. 23. 16. Deut. 16. 10, 13. † ch. 23. 14, 17. Deut. 16. 16.

mined to keep God's law even to the prejudice of their secular interests; but no man ever yet suffered loss by a conscientious attachment to his duty to God. He who is willing and obedient shall eat the good of the land; and God will ever distinguish those in his providence, who respect his commandments.'

A. Clarke.

22. *Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks.* Heb. חג שבועת העשה לך *hag shabuoth taaseh leka*, the feast of sevens shalt thou do unto thee. That is, keep and celebrate by appropriate doings. So the Gr. ποιησεις μοι, *thou shalt do or make to me*. See the phraseology amply illustrated in the Note on Ex. 31. 16. This 'feast of weeks' was a feast to be observed seven weeks after the passover, called otherwise the 'feast of Pentecost,' Lev. 23. 15, 16. Acts, 2. 1. It was held at the same time with the feast of the first-fruits of the wheat-harvest.—¶ *At the year's end.* Heb. לתקופת השנה *tekuphath hashshanah*, at the circuvolution, or circuit, of the year; i. e. at its return; which was in the seventh month, corresponding with our September. The phraseology is illustrated by a comparison of the two following passages relative to the invasion of Israel by Benhadad, king of Syria. 2 Chron. 24. 23, 'And it came to pass at the end of the year (לתקופת השנה *lithkuphath hashshanah*), that the host of Syria came up, &c.' 1 Kings, 20. 26. 'And it came to pass at the return of the year (לתשובת השנה *lithshubath hashshanah*, at the turning of

24 For I will \* cast out the nations before thee, and \* enlarge thy borders: † neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the LORD thy God thrice in the year.

<sup>n</sup> ch. 33. 2. Lev. 18. 24. Deut. 7. 1. Ps. 78. 55. & 80. 8. \* Deut. 12. 20. & 19. 9. 8. † See Gen. 35. 5. 2 Chron. 17. 10. Prov. 16. 7. Acts 18. 10.

*the year*); that Benhadad numbered the Syrians, and went up to Aphek, to fight against Israel.'

23, 24. *Thrice in the year shall all your men-children, &c.* See Note on Ex. 23. 14, 17. Deut. 16. 16. Scarcely any feature of the religion of Israel was more remarkable than this, or more significantly declarative of a particular providence watching over the covenant race. To the eye of reason it would no doubt seem that the observance of this ordinance would expose them to the incursions of the surrounding nations, who would be sure to take advantage of their absence, and rob or capture the country. To human reason too it might appear to have been sufficiently perilous to be cruel, to leave the women, the children, the aged, and the sick, in such a defenceless state. Would it not have been better, it might be asked, that certain delegates should have been appointed to repair to the place of worship in the name of all the rest of the people? But God would not be served by proxy. He commanded, therefore, *all the males* to keep the feasts at the place prescribed; and to remove all apprehensions as to the safety of their property or their families, he pledged himself to protect their frontier and so to overrule the minds of their enemies, that they should not even '*desire*' to invade their land at any of those seasons. Accordingly we look in vain throughout the whole course of their subsequent history for an instance of foreign aggression made under these

25 <sup>z</sup>Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven, <sup>a</sup>neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left until the morning.

26 <sup>b</sup>The first of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring unto the house of the LORD thy God.

<sup>z</sup> ch. 23. 18. <sup>a</sup> ch. 12, 10. <sup>b</sup> ch. 23. 19. Deut. 26. 2, 10.

circumstances. The way of duty is the way of safety.

25, 26. *Thou shalt not offer the blood, &c.* See Note on Ex. 23. 18.—12. 10.—23. 19. Deut. 26. 2.

27. *And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words, &c.* There is some difficulty attending the exposition of this command to Moses respecting the writing the words of the covenant. It is clear from v. 1, of this chapter that God promised to write *with his own hand* the ten commandments on the tables prepared by Moses. The execution of this promise we conceive is expressly recorded in v. 28, 'And he (i. e. God) wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.' The parallel narrative, Deut. 10. 1—4, puts this beyond question, 'At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. *And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest*, and thou shalt put them in the ark. And I made an ark of shittim wood, and hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and went up into the mount, having the two tables in my hand. *And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly*: and the Lord gave them unto me.' What then were the words which Moses wrote? Certainly that summary of

<sup>c</sup>Thou shalt not see the a kid in his mother's milk.

27 And the LORD said unto Moses, Write thou <sup>d</sup>these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee, and with Israel.

<sup>c</sup> ch. 23. 19. Deut. 14. 21. <sup>d</sup> ver. 10. Deut. 4. 13. & 31. 9.

judicial and ceremonial precepts comprised in the verses immediately preceding from v. 11th to v. 26th, which were an appendage to the moral law, and which formed, in all their details, the conditions of the national covenant on the part of the nation. But did Moses write them on the present occasion? This we think may justly be questioned. By recurrence to chap. 24. 3—8, we learn that when Moses came down from the mount he wrote out in a book the collection of laws and precepts, additional to the Decalogue, which form the contents of chapters 21, 22, and 23, and which include every one of the items recited in the present context. Now these laws were not inscribed on the tables which were broken; consequently there was no occasion, on this score, for their being re-written; and if the book already written were preserved, was there any occasion for another copy of the precepts being made at all at this time? It is indeed possible that the short compend here recited may have been transcribed in pursuance of a direction now given to that effect, but on the whole we prefer to consider the verse as more correctly rendered in the pluperfect—'And the Lord *had* said unto Moses, Write thou these words,' &c. This refers the writing back to the occasion just mentioned, of which it is said, 'And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord



28 \*And he was there with the LORD forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink

\* ch. 24. 18. Deut. 9. 9, 18.

hath said will we do. *And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord*, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.' This construction removes, as far as we can perceive, all appearance of discrepancy between the different parts of the narrative. Having repeated the leading specifications of the compact formerly entered into, it was natural to advert to the fact, that Moses had been required to write them down at the time they were first delivered and formally accepted and ratified. If, however, it should still be thought probable that some kind of writing was *now* enjoined upon Moses, we are by no means disposed to join issue with such a conclusion. It is no doubt very supposable, that as they had in their recent transgression broken both the *table-statutes* and the *book-statutes*—the *moral* and the *ceremonial* part of the covenant—God may have seen fit, that the renewal of both these departments of the covenant should be marked by a similar proceeding. As he himself was pleased to restore by re-inscribing the Decalogue, so Moses *may* have been ordered to re-write on parchment the prominent points of the ceremonial law, as a token that both were again in force in their covenant relations.

28. *And he was there with the Lord*

water. And *he* wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.

f ver. 1. ch. 31. 18. & 32. 16. Deut. 4. 13. & 10. 2; 4.

*forty days and forty nights.* Being of course miraculously sustained by the power of God without food or drink, as in the former case, ch. 24. 18. 'It was not long since Moses' former fast of forty days. When he then came down from the hill his first question was not for meat; and now going up again to Sinai, he takes not any repast with him. There is no life to that of faith. 'Man lives not by bread only.' The vision of God did not only satiate, but feast him. What a blessed satiety shall there be when we shall see him as he is, and he shall be all in all to us; since this very frail mortality of Moses was sustained and comforted but with representations of his presence! I see Moses, the receiver of the law, Elias, the restorer of the law, Christ, the fulfiller of the old law, and author of the new, all fasting forty days; and these three great fasters I find together glorious in mount Tabor. Abstinence merits not, but it prepares for good duties. Hence solemn prayer takes ever fasting to attend it, and so much the rather speeds in heaven when it is so accompanied. It is good so to diet the body, that the soul may be fattened.' *Bp. Hall.* In Deut. 9. 18, this second sojourn is thus alluded to; 'And I fell down before the Lord, as at the first, forty days and forty nights: I did neither eat bread, nor drink water, because of all your sins which ye sinned, in doing wickedly in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger.' If we enquire into the *design* of this second forty days' withdrawal and seclusion, the passage now cited seems to disclose one at least of the grand ends which were to be answered by it; viz., to convey to the people a deeper im-

pression of the guilt of their recent iniquitous proceedings. What must they think of the heinousness of their conduct when a period of forty days' earnest intercession, on the part of Moses, accompanied by fasting and prayer, was none too much in which to deprecate the deserved vengeance of heaven? Could they ever after venture to deem sin a light matter? Could they delude themselves with the idea that God was very *easily pacified* in view of a high-handed transgression? Alas, how little aware are most men of the aggravated nature of sins committed against covenant vows and engagements! It is only those who live very near to the light of the throne, and gaze like Moses upon the burning brightness of the divine purity that can appreciate it aright! They see the awful turpitude of rebellion against God, and how difficult it is to recover the lost tokens of his favor. This lesson was now to be taught to the sinning congregation, and nothing would do it more effectually than this long period of fasting and prayer. Again, the same honor was to be secured for the second tables as for the first, and though the thunders and lightnings that marked the first delivery of the law were not repeated, yet the forty days' fasting of Moses *was*, and the tables were to be brought forth, in that respect, 'as at the first.' All the circumstances, in fine, were to be so ordered that the deepest moral impression should be produced upon the general mind of the people.

The remarks of Calvin upon this passage are well worthy of being appended in the present connexion. 'Moses was exempted from the common lot of men that he might usher in a law evidently from heaven. Had he been detained but a few days upon the mount, his authority would not have been sanctioned by so illustrious a miracle. The forty days, therefore, thus spent gave a full attestation to his commission as a

divine legate: for the endurance of so long a fast evidently exceeded the powers of human nature. In order that the majesty of the law might be unquestioned, its minister was distinguished by an angelical glory. He expressly asserts of himself that he neither drank water nor tasted of bread, that by being thus distinguished from ordinary mortals his official dignity might be superior to exception. We are to understand the fast, therefore, here mentioned not as one of mere temperance or sobriety, but of singular privilege, in which a temporary immunity from the infirmity of the flesh was granted, that his condition might be shown to be super-human. He was unconscious of thirst, nor did he struggle any more with the appetite for food than one of the angels. Therefore this abstinence was never drawn into a precedent by any of the prophets, nor did any one think of imitating what all knew was not intended for themselves. I except the case of Elijah, who was sent to renew the law which had almost perished from Israel, and who, as a second Moses, abstained from food and drink for forty days.'—¶ *And he wrote upon the tables, &c.* That is, God wrote, as is evident from the proof adduced under the foregoing remarks, v. 27. 'Moses heard, and God wrote. Our true Moses repairs that law of God which we, in our nature, had broken; he revives it for us, and it is accepted of God, no less than if the first character of his law had been still entire. We can give nothing but the table; it is God that must write in it. Our hearts are but a bare board till God by his finger engrave his law in them. Yea, Lord, we are a rough quarry; hew thou us out, and square us fit for thee to write upon. Bp. Hall.

29. *And it came to pass when Moses came down, &c.* Notwithstanding the slight air of confusion in the statement of this verse, the meaning of the writer

29 ¶ And it came to pass when Moses came down from mount Sinai (with the <sup>g</sup>two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the mount) that Moses wist not that <sup>h</sup>the skin of his face shone, while he talked with him.

<sup>g</sup> ch. 32. 15.

<sup>h</sup> Matt. 17. 2. 2 Cor. 3. 7. 13.

is yet too obvious to be misunderstood. The time of Jehovah's 'talking with him' was indeed prior to his coming down from the mount, and it was then that his face began to shine; but he had not become conscious of the fact till after he had descended. The reason why his countenance shone now, and not when he came down the first time from the mount undoubtedly was, that during the second time he had been favored with far more glorious views of the divine character and perfections than before. The original for 'wist not that the skin of his face shone' is **לֹא יָדַע כִּי קָרַן עָר פָּנָיו** *lo yada ki karan or panauv*, were the verb **קָרַן** *karan* signifies *to irradiate, to shoot forth or emit rays of light*; whence, from the idea of *shooting forth*, comes the noun **קֶרֶן** *keren*, *a horn*. This fact throws an important light upon the well-known passage in the sublime description of the Most High, Hab. 3. 3, 4, 'God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had *horns* coming out of his hands; and there was the hiding of his power.' It is not perhaps to be confidently affirmed that this rendering is erroneous, inasmuch as the original word is that which is usually and properly translated *horns*. Yet we think that scarcely any one can help being conscious of some slight incongruity in the imagery. The head, and not the hands, is the proper place for the outgrowth of *horns*. But suppose the term to be rendered 'rays,' and to have reference to the *streaming or flashing splendors* which emanated from the hands of the

personified glory of Jehovah, and the image is far more grand and impressive. Conceive the word, in fact, to be but another term for *lightnings*, and we see at once with what propriety it is added, 'And there was the hiding of his power.' What more striking emblem could be imagined of the resistless might of Omnipotence? Here too we are not improbably enabled to trace the origin of the ancient Greek mythologic device, which represents Jupiter, the father of the gods, as grasping the *lightnings* or *thunderbolts* in his right hand, as a symbol of his power over the elements. We suggest this, however, as rather probable than certain. Whatever may be thought of it, no doubt can remain as to the etymological affinity between 'rays' and 'horns,' and with this fact before us, we can easily account for the strange rendering of the Lat. Vulgate; 'Ignorabat quod *cornuta* esset facies sua,' *he knew not that his face was HORNED*, which is evidently as improper as it would be to translate the word 'rayed' when applied to an ox or a goat. Yet in accordance with this error, the Italian painters, who were unacquainted with any other version, have for the most part represented Moses with the uncouth appendage of *horns*! These pictures have been copied into engravings, and thus it is that in ancient biblical cuts we often see him thus depicted. This circumstance of 'rays' and 'horns' having a common radical has led moreover to a *verbal* as well as a *pictorial* confounding the two. Thus the eloquent Jeremy Taylor in his 'Holy Dying,' p. 17, describes the rising sun as 'peeping over the eastern hills, thrusting out his *golden horns*.'

The Gr. version renders nearer to the sense of the original by *δεδοξασται*, *was glorified, or made glorious*, whence the apostle, 2 Cor. 3. 7, says, 'The children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for *the glory* (*δοξα*) of his countenance, i. e. the exceeding brightness. Chal. 'Moses knew not that the brightness of the glory of his face was multiplied.' Sir Thomas Brown, according to the Editor of the Pictorial Bible, is probably correct in his understanding of the matter, after Tremellius and Estius; 'His face was radiant, and dispersing beams, like many horns or cones about his head; which is also consonant unto the original signification, and yet observed in the pieces (pictures) of our Savior and the Virgin Mary, who are commonly drawn with scintillations or radiant halos, about their head; which, after the French expression, are called, the Glory.' He remarks, moreover, that the custom among painters of putting 'glories' around the heads of sacred persons no doubt arose from this fact concerning Moses. 'We are not aware,' says he, 'of any other authority, except that the *raiment* of Christ became shining at the transfiguration. The ancient heathen considered an irradiation or lambent flame about the head, as a manifestation of the divine favor and protection. But whether this arose from any tradition concerning Moses it is impossible to determine.' The notions of the Mohammedans on this subject, which are very curious, and which probably arose from a Scriptural source, may be seen detailed in my 'Life of Mohammed.'—π *Wist not that the skin of his face shone.* What was visible to others was hidden to himself. Although from the effects of his transforming communion with the divine presence he had become in a measure 'changed into the same image, from glory to glory,' yet he remained in perfect unconsciousness of the fact! How

this could have happened, we feel but little interest to inquire. Calvin thinks it not improbable, that the miraculous effulgence may have been restrained from bursting forth until Moses came into the immediate presence of Aaron and the people, that they might have an impressive view of the phenomenon. But however this may be, it is a theme of more profitable contemplation as viewed in its emblematical applications. 'He wist not that the skin of his face shone;' nor is it ever found that those who bear much of the divine image are conscious of the moral glory which has passed upon them. Their minds are so fixed upon their own defects; they are so deeply convinced of the corruption of their nature; they are so profoundly penetrated with the sense of their ill desert, that so far from recognising any peculiar tokens of divine favor in themselves, they are rather prone to say with Job, 'If I had called, and he had answered me; yet would I not believe that he had hearkened unto my voice.' Instead of realizing the possession of distinguished graces, they still count themselves as 'less than the least of all saints.' To others their spiritual excellencies shine forth with great lustre, but they are blind to them themselves; and the nearer they attain to the view of the divine glory; the more familiar their converse with infinite excellence, the more unconscious do they become of its effects upon them. Has one been recently on the mount in beatific fellowship with God, the evidence of it will appear when he comes down. It will show itself in the heightened meekness and sweetness of his temper, in the sanctity of his demeanor, in the quickened zeal of his efforts to do good, and in the subdued, heavenly, and Christ-like spirit that breathes through all his deportment. But to all this he will be himself unconscious. 'Whatever beauty God puts upon us, we should still be filled with such an

30 And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh him.

humble sense of our own unworthiness and manifold infirmities, as will make us even overlook and forget that which makes our faces shine.' *Henry.*

30. *And they were afraid to come nigh him.* 'The circumstance of their being strangely repelled from his presence, was probably the first intimation that Moses had of there being any thing preternatural or peculiar in his appearance. How must he have been surprised to find himself the unsuspecting cause of a dispersion among his friends, somewhat similar to that which took place among the band that came under the conduct of Judas to apprehend the Savior, when a supernatural something in his aspect struck them so overpoweringly that 'they went backward and fell to the ground?' But why this intimidation at this time? What made Israel to shrink from the face of their leader, intercessor, and friend? What could render the presence of his affectionate brother formidable to Aaron? Moses had come to them with his heart overflowing with good will, and exulting in the thought of having procured pardon and reconciliation for their offences. Why then do they avoid his presence, instead of greeting him with a cordial welcome? Alas, the same inward impulse which led the first transgressors to 'hide themselves from the presence of the Lord,' is at work in their bosoms. It is conscious guilt that is driving them away from unconscious goodness. Under the awful terrors of the glory of Jehovah a few weeks before they had earnestly besought, saying, 'Let Moses speak to us and we will hear.' But now even the bare look of Moses fills them with dismay, and they flee from the sight of it! An ac-

31 And Moses called unto them; and Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation returned unto him: and Moses talked with them.

cusing conscience has so disturbed their perception, that the beaming radiance of his countenance has converted him into a flaming minister of heaven prepared to execute vengeance upon them! 'That which should have comforted, affrights them; yea, Aaron himself, that before went up into the mountain to see and speak with God, now is afraid to see him that had seen God! Such a fear there is in guiltiness—such confidence in innocency. When the soul is once cleared from sin, it shall run to that glory with joy, the least glimpse whereof now appals it, and sends it away in terror. How could the Israelites now choose but think, How shall we abide to look God in the face, since our eyes are dazzled with the face of Moses? And well may we still argue, if the image of God which he hath set in the fleshly forehead of authority daunt us, how shall we stand before the dreadful tribunal of heaven?' *Bp. Hall.*

31. *And Moses called unto them, &c.* Whatever might have been the cause of their fleeing, he was conscious that it was nothing in the state of his feelings towards them. The real cause, however, was soon disclosed to him, and far from being elated with the honor conferred upon him or desirous to make his authority felt in keeping his people at a distance, his disposition is quite the reverse. Considered in itself, the phenomenon would tend greatly to enhance his authority among the congregation. There could not be a more striking attestation to the divine commission which he had received, as their leader and law-giver, than this supernatural appearance. It invested him with a badge of honor such as no dia-

dem could have conferred. It was in fact a crown of light to his head; and decisively marked him out as one who was appointed of God to fill the place which he occupied. Yet he is far from priding himself upon this distinction, or from a desire to overawe his brethren. On the contrary he is exceedingly anxious to reassure their confidence. Accordingly in all the simplicity of a kind and affectionate spirit, he invites them to come near. And in order to remove all let or hindrance to their returning, he covers his face with a veil, which he continued to wear all the time that he was speaking to them, but laid aside whenever he went into the tabernacle to appear before the Lord. In doing this, he set a noble example of condescending meekness, of modesty, of self-renunciation. Had he been a man of another mould, he would probably have stood upon his prerogative, and said, 'If God has been pleased miraculously to distinguish me, am I responsible for the effects of it? If there is a supernatural splendor about my face, God put it there; and it is not probable that he would have made it so conspicuous had he intended it should be concealed. It is much more proper that you should hide your guilty heads, than that I should, draw a veil over mine.' But so spake not Moses. He chose rather to hide from their view the wonderful work of God upon his person than to forego the opportunity of declaring his will to the people—a conduct which fully warrants the remark of Bp. Hall, that 'Moses had more glory by his veil than by his face.' Vain glory always defeats the ends at which it aims, while humility gains the point of which it little thought, for which it was least of all anxious. Who does but esteem Moses, modestly shrouded in a veil, infinitely more than he does the most loquacious boaster and exhibitor of himself, who ever sought to shine in the eyes of men,

while he heeded not how he might appear in the eyes of God? In this incident we learn what kind of spirit should ever mark the deportment of him, who is favored with high spiritual attainments and revelations. It is indeed scarcely possible to converse much with God without appearing more glorious in the eyes of man. But nothing can be more foreign to the temper of such a man than an ostentatious blazoning of what God has done for his soul. He will not be forward to talk of remarkable discoveries, to exhibit the shining of his face, to abash and confound a less favored brother. On the contrary, he will be meek, modest, and retiring. He will be more anxious to do good to others, than to gain eclat for himself. He will accommodate himself to the weakness of those whose progress may not have kept pace with his own. He will strive to abate envy by condescension and courtesy, nor will he be forward to make his experiences the theme of discourse, unless, as in the case of Paul, a supreme regard to the glory of God may compel him to bear witness to extraordinary manifestations, in order to put to shame and silence the disparaging reflections of gainsayers. Even then it will be a reluctant disclosure that is made. It will be made only because it is extorted by a paramount regard to the interests of truth. He will say, or at least feel, with the apostle, 'I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me.'

Again, the incident before us is a plain and striking lesson to all who undertake to instruct others. It is a pitiful ambition, to seek merely to shine. The great aim of a moral teacher should be to communicate most effectually useful and saving knowledge. In doing this he is to think little of what immediately concerns himself, or the impression which he may personally make. If the minds of men, if the church of God, be enlightened, what matters it if he is

32 And afterward all the children of Israel came nigh: <sup>i</sup>and he gave them in commandment all that the LORD had spoken with him in mount Sinai.

<sup>i</sup> cn. 24. 3.

himself somewhat obscured? He is required to consult the condition and capacities of those for whose good he labors. He is to accommodate himself to their weakness; he is not to oppress their minds with a *burden* even of truth; he is in all things to study their edification. So doing he may safely leave his reputation to God. He will take care of it. Let his mind be intent upon usefulness; let him be willing joyfully to give up fame for the sake of doing good, and he need not fear but as much celebrity will crown his name as will benefit the cause to which he is devoted, and more he will not desire.

But the veil which Moses constantly wore in his intercourse with the people, he laid aside whenever he went to commune with God, and to receive instruction from him. There the lustre of his face would be renewed and brightened again in the beams of that splendor from which it had been first received; and doubtless on every return from such visits, the Israelites would perceive that he had been with God. And so the truth will generally evince itself to others whenever any one has been favored with near approaches to God in prayer and communion. His face will shine brighter upon every renewed access to the throne of grace, and the beauty of the Lord his God will be upon him. He will be perceptibly more and more transformed into the image of that with which he is familiar. His very exterior will be meliorated and improved. The exercises of the closet will be seen and felt in the serenity of his countenance, in the benignity of the eye, in the gentle tones of the voice, and in the in-

33 And *till* Moses had done speaking with them, he put <sup>k</sup>a veil on his face.

<sup>k</sup> 2 Cor. 3. 13.

creased affability and graciousness of the whole deportment. The world itself will take knowledge of the disciple who has been with Jesus. Yet the main remark suggested by this part of the narrative is, that when we come to present ourselves before God every veil must be laid aside, and no disguise or concealment attempted before the eyes of him with whom we have to do, and to whom all things are naked and open. As we do in fact appear then in the unveiled truth of our character, it is folly to act as if it were not so; as if any illusion could be practised upon Omniscience. 'When Moses went to speak with God, he pulled off his veil. It was good reason he should present to God that face which he had made; there had been more need of his veil to hide the glorious face of God from him, than to hide his from God; but his faith and thankfulness serve for both these uses. Hypocrites are contrary to Moses. He showed his worst to men, his best to God; they show their best to men, their worst to God; but God sees both their veil and their face; and I know not whether he more hates their veil of dissimulation, or their face of wickedness.' *Bp. Hall.*

33. And *till* Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face. The sense is undoubtedly correctly rendered, although the idiom of the original requires the insertion of 'till' in our translation. Rosenmuller and some few others do indeed contend that the true rendering requires the omission of all supplementary words, inasmuch as Moses intended to say that he had finished speaking before he assumed a veil. But this construction goes so decidedly

34 But <sup>1</sup>when Moses went in before the LORD to speak with him, he took the vail off, until he came out. And he came out and spake unto the children of Israel *that* which he was commanded.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. 3. 16.

against the whole current of ancient interpreters, and the manifest drift of the context, that it will be superfluous labor to confute it. We have no hesitation in taking the passage as it reads, and thus understood we are led to view it in connexion with the typical application made of it by the apostle, 2 Cor. 3. 6—18. He evidently employs the incident as shadowing forth in a typical way the relative glories of the legal and evangelical dispensations. We give the passage at length. 'But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken

35 And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone: and Moses put the vail upon his face again, until he went in to speak with Him.

away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' Here it is obvious that Moses appearing with his face veiled stands as a symbol of his own dispensation, which was in fact only the gospel under a veil. Whether Moses himself was conscious that any such mystic or spiritual import was couched under the incident may well be doubted; but we can have no doubt that the Spirit of God by the hand of Paul has sanctioned this allegorical use of the fact in question. It is plainly set before us as having a three-fold phasis of emblematic meaning.

(1.) It is represented as being symbolical of the *intrinsic* glory or excellence of that dispensation, notwithstanding it is the special drift of the apostle to show that however glorious or excellent that dispensation was, it had no glory *compared* with the superior glory of the gospel. The law was glorious in the pure and holy nature of its precepts, which reflected the attributes of a glorious God, and it was glorious in the circumstances of its delivery. But as the glory of Moses' face was absorbed and lost in the splendor of God when he went into his presence in the tabernacle or on the mount, so the brightness and excellence of the Mosaic dispensation are eclipsed and swallowed up in the transcendent brightness of the gospel. The one is the shadow, the other the substance. The one is a ministration of condemnation,



the other of justification. Let us not then undervalue our distinguished privileges. We should no doubt be prone to think ourselves highly favored had we, like the Jews, a minister of God's word, in whose very face we could see a miraculous and divine light shining continually to prove him a man of God; but we have in fact a far greater privilege in the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which is constantly shedding forth the light of life, and irradiating men's minds with its spiritual beams.

(2.) It is used by the apostle to represent the *comparative obscurity* of the Mosaic dispensation. The veil intimated the indistinct view which the Israelites had of the ultimate scope of their law. Theirs was a system of rites and ceremonies, under which was *wrapped up* or *covered* a variety of spiritual subjects that their minds did not penetrate. They did not lift the veil so as to obtain a sight of the spiritual treasures which it concealed. They did not look to the 'end of the commandment,' which was to be 'abolished,' but rested in the mere letter, or literal meaning, which was comparatively meagre and barren.

(3.) It represents the *blindness and ignorance* under which the Jewish mind labored down to the time when Paul wrote, and which is not even yet, after the lapse of eighteen hundred years, removed. Age after age the inveterate prejudice and obduracy of the Jewish heart has prevented them from discerning the true sense of their own law, of its figures, types, and institutions, just as effectually as the veil on the face of Moses prevented them from beholding the beauty of his countenance. They read the books of their lawgiver, but in the sacrifices and services there prescribed they see no intimation of that Lamb of richer blood and that Priest of higher name, whom *we* are taught to recognise as foreshadowed by them. They read the predictions of the prophets, but they do not see them pointing

to the Savior Christ, the true Messiah, in whom all their oracles are fulfilled. The thick veil of error and unbelief is upon their minds, and until that is taken away, as we learn it eventually shall be, the light of the glory of God in the gospel of his Son will not shine into them.

But let it not be forgotten that this veil of darkness and unbelief is not confined to the Jewish people. The natural man, whether Jew or Gentile, does not receive the things of the Spirit of God. We see it and wonder at it in *them*, but are unconscious of it in *ourselves*. Yet we are in fact monuments of greater obduracy than they, because there was in the very nature of the case, a veil cast over their dispensation which is removed from ours. Let us be reminded then that 'if the gospel be *hid* (Gr. *κεκαλυμμενον*, *veiled*) it is *hid* to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not. The prevailing power of a *worldly spirit* may as effectually tend to *judaize* our minds and thus obscure our spiritual vision, as the strictest adherence to the traditions of Rabbinical elders. How earnestly then should we strive to divest ourselves of every interposing medium that would prevent the free admission of the glorious light of the gospel into our souls! With what a transforming power does it come! To what a height of privilege and blessedness does it exalt its possessor! 'We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' These words contain an evident allusion to the Old Testament narrative which we are now considering. The apostle is drawing a contrast between the genius of the two dispensations as it relates to the privilege of their respective subjects. When Moses was favored with a partial view of the glory

of God as he passed by him, he was not only stationed in a cave, a cleft in the rock, but a cloud was interposed between him and the resplendent object of his vision, lest its brightness should be too dazzling for his visual powers. Yet notwithstanding this precaution, so much of the splendor of the divine glory was communicated to his countenance that he was obliged to veil himself when he appeared before the people. As he could not see God without the medium of a cloud, so they could not see *him* without the medium of a veil. The one was the counterpart of the other. But under the gospel the case is entirely changed. We can now look upon the moral glory of God 'with open face,' without any intervening cloud or veil. And when he says we behold this glory 'as in a glass' (*κατοπτριζόμεναι*), the allusion is doubtless to the effect produced by looking into a highly burnished mirror. Macknight renders it, 'we all reflecting as mirrors the glory of the Lord.' If a strong light were thrown upon the polished surface of a mirror, the rays would be cast by reflection upon the face of the beholder, which would consequently be strongly illuminated. Such was the case to some extent with Moses. The radiation that came upon him from the glory of the Shekinah, and so wondrously illumined his face, was a kind of flashing reflection from the transcendent brightness of the Deity. But still more signally does this occur under the gospel. The glory of God, the splendor of the divine perfections, is thrown on the gospel, so to speak, like a bright light on a polished mirror, and that glory is so reflected on him that believingly contemplates it, that he appears to be transformed into the same image. Nothing can be more significant or happy than the figure employed; and we should at least draw from it the inference, that we are not to rest satisfied unless we find that the view which we take of the

divine character in the gospel is *assimilating*. No visible effect analogous to that wrought upon Moses is indeed to be expected to be produced upon our bodies, but the character of our minds will be affected, the graces of our souls will be quickened, by habitual intercourse and converse with the glorious realities of the gospel of Christ. Nor should any thing short of this content those who are hoping at last to 'awake in his likeness.'

Again, we learn from this incident as used by the apostle, how much the Old Testament and the New serve mutually to explain each other. Very often what is obscure in the former becomes luminous in the latter; and again, what is dark or indistinct in the New Testament often receives a flood of light from some kindred passage in the Old. No sentiment more injurious to the interests of truth could possibly come into vogue, than that the Old Testament is superseded by the New, and therefore that the study of it has but slight claims upon the Christian. The Old and the New Testament form one continuous system of revelation, the latter being merely the developement of the interior sense, and the substantiation of the typical shadows, of the former. He who sees in the books of Moses and the other writings of the Old Testament, nothing but the histories of certain events long since past, and a mass of religious usages and ceremonies practised by a particular people, with none of which we have any special concern, may be said to look not merely with a *veil*, but with a *bandage*, upon his eyes, and as he reads without understanding, he reads without profit. Such an one is not only unfaithful to the true interests of his own soul, but he is guilty of downright disparagement of the oracles of God, which are able to make us wise unto salvation. Let us then pray the prayer of David in reference to the same Scriptures, 'Open thou mine eyes

## "CHAPTER XXXV.

AND Moses gathered all the congregation of the children of Israel together, and said unto them, <sup>a</sup>These are the words which the LORD hath commanded, that ye should do them.

<sup>a</sup> ch. 34. 32.

that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.'

Finally, let the suggestion come home to us in all its power, that if we belong to the true Israel of God we shall not always see thus through a glass darkly. The glimpses of the heavenly glory which we catch here below from time to time are indeed refreshing and precious to the soul. But they are transient and evanescent. God reveals himself as he did to Moses, *in passing by*. We see him for a moment, and he is gone. But the time is at hand when the beatific vision will be at once perfect and perpetual. In what lustre and glory will the children of the kingdom then shine forth! What will be the blissful state of those who shall be admitted into the paradise of God, when they shall each of them appear in a splendor not like that which invested Moses at mount Sinai, but rather like that which enrobed him as a garment of light at the transfiguration-scene of mount Tabor! How different from our present state! Now we see but vaguely, and know but in part. There we shall see face to face, and know as we are known; for no cloud will intercept the enraptured vision. Was Moses made honorable in the sight of the chosen tribes, by converse with Jehovah at Sinai? What then will be their glory, who shall enjoy a communion with him as uninterrupted as the flowings of his love, as endless as the days of eternity! Behold, and wonder; behold, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God! Then shall the ransomed 'shine forth as the

VOL. II. 23

2 <sup>b</sup>Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the LORD: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death.

<sup>b</sup> ch. 20. 9. & 31. 14, 15. Lev. 23. 3. Numb. 15. 32, &c. Deut. 5. 12. Luke 13. 14.

sun in the kingdom of their Father,' a blessed spectacle to each other, and to all the kindreds of heaven! It will be the eternal day of Christ's and his saint's transfiguration, when *they* shall say, with a rapture which Peter could not feel, even on the holy mount, 'Master, it is good for us to be here!'

## CHAPTER XXXV.

*The Offerings for the Tabernacle.*

1, 2. And Moses gathered all the congregation of the children of Israel, &c. God having now become reconciled to his people, and the covenant which they had, on their part, annulled by their recent transgression, having been graciously renewed, the delayed work of building the Tabernacle is ordered to go on. This edifice was to be constructed and furnished of materials supplied by the liberality of the people; and they were now gathered together to receive afresh the intimation of the Lord's will respecting the undertaking. The directions now given are prefaced with a repetition of the law of the Sabbath. As the sanctification of the seventh day is all along represented as a point of prime moment in the system of religious service ordained by God, we are not to be surprised to find it again and again insisted on and enforced in a great variety of ways. In the original the command is given in terms of peculiar emphasis;—'On the seventh day there shall be to you holiness, a sabbath of sabbatism to the Lord.' On that day no work was to be done, not even the work of the tabernacle. The

3 • Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath-day.

4 ¶ And Moses spake unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, saying, <sup>d</sup>This is the thing

<sup>c</sup> ch. 16. 23.    <sup>d</sup> ch. 25. 1, 2.

sanctity of the Sabbath was greater than that of the sanctuary, and its holy rest must not be invaded under any pretence whatever. However important the outward apparatus of worship, it was of less consequence than the spiritual necessities of the soul. One day in seven was none too much to be devoted to a hallowed recess from secular business, and to a devout meditation upon those themes which the Sabbath was intended to familiarise to their minds. It was a day commemorative of a rest that was past, and typical of one that was to come. Its peculiar designation, 'sabbath of sabbatism,' points to a *special plenitude* in the degree of rest which it implied, as if it were a designed shadow of that rest, spiritual and eternal, which remains for the people of God.—¶ *Whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death.* The clear and explicit declaration of this precept and its frequent repetition, could leave room for no possible doubt as to the will of God respecting it; and consequently the guilt of violating it would be enhanced in proportion. On these grounds, therefore, the severe penalty of death is annexed to the command, from which it is evident that it was considered in this relation as a *judicial statute*.

3. *Ye shall kindle no fire, &c.* Not, probably, that fires in their private dwellings were absolutely forbidden at all seasons, for the winters in Judea are often very cold, but the design seems to have been mainly to prohibit fires being made for the purpose of carrying on the work of the sanctuary,

which the LORD commanded, saying,

5 Take ye from among you an offering unto the LORD: <sup>e</sup>whosoever is of a willing heart, let him bring it, an offering of the LORD; gold, and silver, and brass,

<sup>e</sup> ch. 25. 2.

just about to be commenced, the importance and sacredness of which they might interpret as constituting a license for a breach of the Sabbath. By this precept they were taught, on the other hand, that no plea of this kind would avail; that none of the various processes of fusing or moulding the gold, or silver, or brass appointed for the work of the tabernacle would be allowed to interfere with the devout observance of holy time, when every thing but the duties of worship were to come to a solemn pause. The spirit of the precept probably applies to many species of employment which, under the plea of necessity, are at the present day prosecuted on the Sabbath.

5. *Take ye from among you an offering unto the Lord.* Heb. תרומה *terumah*, a heave-offering, from רם *rum*, to be lifted up, exalted, elevated. Gr. and Chal. 'a separation;' i. e. a gift separated and set apart to the service of God, from their other possessions. See Note on Ex. 29. 28. In the requisition for their offerings or gifts it will be observed that Moses put no compulsion upon the people, nor did he give any directions as to the quantity of the different articles which they should bring. The whole was to be left to the promptings of their own willing and generous hearts. God loves a cheerful giver, and instead of imposing a tax, he offered them an opportunity of showing, by spontaneous expressions, how much they were disposed to do for him who had laid them under such infinite obligations. The most costly offering was not too precious, nor was the mean-

6 And blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair,

7 And rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, and shittim-wood.

8 And oil for the light, and spices for anointing oil, and for the sweet incense,

f ch. 25. 6.

9 And onyx-stones, and stones to be set for the ephod, and for the breast-plate.

10 And every wise-hearted among you shall come, and make all that the LORD hath commanded;

g ch. 31. 6.

est too small for him who accepteth according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. To the same principle God now addresses himself in making his demands for the charitable contributions of his people. *We* have not indeed any such *material* building to raise, and therefore may be sometimes prone to imagine that the same occasion for the display of liberality does not exist. But is there not a *spiritual* temple which God designs to have erected for himself, wherein he may be glorified? And is not that temple infinitely more dear to him than any which can be formed by human hands? Should not the manifestation of his presence, and the establishment of his kingdom in the world, call forth our zeal, as much as the erection of that fabric in the wilderness did the zeal of the Israelites? The material tabernacle was only a shadow of that better habitation wherein God delights to dwell. To the erection of this spiritual house every true christian Israelite is called to contribute according as God hath given him ability. And let it be ever remembered that the blessing will go with our contributions according to the free, cordial, generous spirit with which they are made. It is not the amount given, but the motive of the giver, which is of account in God's sight. Even the poor widow who casts in her two mites will receive an equal plaudit with Araunah, of whom it is said, 'All these things did Araunah, as a king, give unto the king.' They who do what they can show evidently that they would do more if they could.—

¶ *Of a willing heart.* Heb. נָדִיב לִבּוֹ *nedib libbo*, *willing (in) his heart*. The original term נָדִיב *nadib*, signifying *free, spontaneous, liberal*, and sometimes rendered *noble*, is more frequently employed as a designation of *princes*, from the *generosity*, and *nobleness*, and *largeness of soul* by which they are supposed to be characterised. In its substantive form it occurs Ps. 68. 9, 'Thou, O God, didst send a *plentiful rain*, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance when it was weary.' Heb. 'a rain of liberalities;' which Chandler in his *Life of David*, vol. 2. p. 61, renders, 'a shower, as it were voluntarily falling,' and refers it to the abundant supply of manna and quails which descended upon the Israelites like a falling rain from heaven; an interpretation which seems to be confirmed by Ps. 78. 24, 27, 'He opened the doors of heaven, and *rained* down manna upon them to eat. He *rained* flesh also upon them as dust, and feathered fowls like as the sand of the sea.'

6. *Blue, and purple, and scarlet, &c.* As the principal items contained in this chapter have already been largely considered in the Notes on chapters 25—31, the reader is referred to them and to the parallel texts in the margin for the requisite explanations.

10. *Every wise-hearted.* Heb. כָּל לֵב חָכָם *kol hakam lib*, *every one wise of heart*; i. e. apt, skilful, ingenious in the various kinds of workmanship now required. The same term is applied to the women, v. 25, 26. The Heb. word חָכְמָה *hokmah* is used variously, according to Maimonides; some-

11 <sup>h</sup> The tabernacle, his tent, and his covering, his taches, and his boards, his bars, his pillars, and his sockets;

12 <sup>i</sup> The ark, and the staves thereof, *with* the mercy-seat, and the vail of the covering;

13 The <sup>k</sup> tables, and his staves, and all his vessels, <sup>l</sup> and the shewbread;

14 <sup>m</sup> The candlestick also for the light, and his furniture, and his lamps, with the oil for the light;

15 <sup>n</sup> And the incense-altar, and his staves, <sup>o</sup> and the anointing oil, and <sup>p</sup> the sweet incense, and the hanging for the door at the entering in of the tabernacle;

16 <sup>q</sup> The altar of burnt-offering, with his brazen grate, his staves, and all his vessels, the laver and his foot;

<sup>h</sup> ch. 26. 1, 2, &c. <sup>i</sup> ch. 25. 10, &c. <sup>k</sup> ch. 25. 23. <sup>l</sup> ch. 25. 30. Lev. 24. 5, 6. <sup>m</sup> ch. 25. 31, &c. <sup>n</sup> ch. 30. 1. <sup>o</sup> ch. 30. 23. <sup>p</sup> ch. 30. 34. <sup>q</sup> ch. 27. 1.

times for a deep knowledge of divine things; sometimes for moral virtue; sometimes, as here, for skill in mechanical arts; and sometimes for craft and subtlety. A passage in Homer, quoted by Aristotle, remarkably coinciding with this, shows that this sense of the term is not unknown to classical usage; 'The gods neither made him a ditcher, nor a plowman, nor any other sort of *wise man*.' Upon this Aristotle observes, 'We ascribe *wisdom* in arts to those who excel in them.' Indeed the character given of Wisdom by Solomon, Prov. 8. 12, would seem to carry with it an allusion to this sense of the term, 'I Wisdom dwell with prudence, and find out the knowledge of *witty inventions*.' The word לֵב *lêb*, heart, is used in accordance with the popular notions of that age and people, that the heart is the seat of the understanding.

11. *The tabernacle, his tent, and his*

17 <sup>r</sup> The hangings of the court, his pillars, and their sockets, and the hanging for the door of the court;

18 The pins of the tabernacle, and the pins of the court, and their cords;

19 <sup>s</sup> The clothes of service, to do service in the holy *place*, the holy garments for Aaron the priest, and the garments of his sons, to minister in the priest's office.

20 ¶ And all the congregation of the children of Israel departed from the presence of Moses.

21 And they came, every one <sup>t</sup> whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing, *and* they brought the LORD's offering to the work of the tabernacle of the congregation, and for all his service, and for the holy garments.

<sup>r</sup> ch. 27. 9. <sup>s</sup> ch. 31. 10. & 39. 1, 41. Numb. 4, 5, 6, &c. <sup>t</sup> ver. 5. 22, 36, 29. ch. 25. 2. & 36. 2. 1 Chron. 28. 2, 9. & 29. 9. Ezra 7. 27. 2 Cor. 8. 12. & 9. 7.

*covering*. These three terms evidently import in this connexion the three exterior sets of curtains. Compare Note Ex. 26. 1, where this sense of 'tabernacle' and 'tent' is confirmed.

18. *The pins of the tabernacle*, &c. These were not particularly mentioned before, though we have previously given a cut of them under ch. 27. 10. Josephus says that to every board of the tabernacle, and to every pillar of the court, there were ropes or cords fastened at the top, hanging the other end secured to a πασσαλος, *nail* or *pin*, which at a good distance off was driven into the ground up to the head, a cubit deep. It was a nail or pin of this description which Jael drove into the temples of Sisera. See Note on Judg. 4. 21.

20, 21. *And all the congregation—departed*, &c. Having had the will of God now fully explained to them, they proceed deliberately to *act* in accord-

22 And they came, both men and women, as many as were willing-hearted, *and* brought bracelets, and ear-rings, and rings, and tablets, all jewels of gold: and every man that offered, *offered* an offering of gold unto the LORD.

ance with the instructions received. They retire from the assembly to their tents, but only to return again with their offerings in their hands. They had no bibles at home with which to compare the requisitions of their leader, and ‘see if these things were so,’ but his commands they regarded as imperative and ultimate, and would not allow their zeal to cool before obeying them. There was no doubt, in view of their recent transgression, the working of a spirit very much akin to that awakened by the apostle and described in his second epistle to the Corinthian church; ‘For behold this self-same thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter.’ The idea of having once done evil ought to operate as a powerful incentive to ever after doing good.—¶ *Every one whose heart stirred him up.* Heb. **אֲשֶׁר נִשְׂאוֹ לִבּוֹ** *asher nesäu libbo*, whose heart lifted him up. Chal. ‘Whose heart was spontaneous.’ Every one whose heart was raised to a free and cheerful promptitude; and such undoubtedly was the case with the congregation *en masse*. We do not consider the language as intended to bear invidiously upon some by implying that they were *not* thus liberal; that they either did not offer at all or at best but grudgingly. It is rather an intimation of the general spirit which actuated the whole body of the people. Possibly individual ex-

23 And <sup>u</sup>every man with whom was found blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats’ hair, and red skins of rams, and badgers’ skins, brought *them*.

<sup>u</sup> 1 Chron. 29. 8.

ceptions might have been found, but they are not regarded in the comprehensive estimate of the Spirit.

22. *And they came, both men and women.* Heb. **הָאֲנָשִׁים עַל הַנְּשִׁים** *ha-anashim al hannashim*, the men upon, over and above, in addition to, the women; a peculiar phraseology, which implies, according to the Jewish critic Abrabanel, that the women came first and presented their offerings, and were then followed by the men. This sense is approved by Cartwright, one of the soundest commentators who has ever undertaken to illustrate the Scriptures from Rabbinical sources. Nor has the prompt and forward obedience of woman ever belied this character in any age of the world.—¶ *And brought bracelets, and ear-rings, &c.* Their offerings were various according to their various possessions. They show themselves, if any thing, more forward to give to the service of God than they had before been to contribute to the fabrication of the golden calf. There we read of *ear-rings* only having been offered, but here of all kinds of precious articles, as if nothing was too good or too rich to be parted with for the honor of God. Indeed it would seem from the final clause of v. 22, that the spirit of the offerers was so acceptable in the sight of God that he regarded every offering, whatever it was, as an offering of gold. Even the goats’ hair and rams’ skins acquired so high a value in his esteem from the motives which prompted the givers, that they were accounted as oblations of pure gold! —¶ *Tablets.* Heb. **כֻּמָּז** *kumaz*. This is a very doubtful word, occurring

24 Every one that did offer an offering of silver and brass brought the LORD's offering: and every man with whom was found shittim-wood for any work of the service, brought it.

25 And all the women that were w<sup>w</sup> wise-hearted did spin with their hands, and brought that which they had spun, *both* of blue, and of purple, *and* of scarlet, and of fine linen.

26 And all the women whose heart stirred them up in wisdom spun goats' hair.

<sup>w</sup> ch. 28. 3. & 31. 6. & 36. 1. 2 Kings 23. 7. Prov. 31. 19, 22, 24.

only here and in Num. 31. 50. Geddes, Boothroyd, and others render it by 'lockets,' answering to the Roman 'bullæ,' or the 'baccatum monile' of Virgil, which was a necklace formed of gems or precious stones, resembling berries. Such trinkets are still worn by the Arabians. Bochart supposes it was a kind of supporting girdle worn by the women round the bosom. The Editor of the Pictorial Bible, on the other hand, supposes it to have been an ornamented hoop or band surrounding the head. His plates represent such an ornament among the articles of Egyptian costume. They were at any rate probably a part of the spoils obtained from the Egyptians.—¶ *Every man that offered.* Heb. הִנִּיף *hîniph*, that waved; from the circumstance of their oblations being *heaved up* and *waved* when offered to the Lord; consequently called, Ex. 38. 24, 'a wave-offering.'

25. *And all the women that were wise-hearted, &c.* The sense in which 'wisdom' is predicated of all these various arts and handicrafts has been already explained above on v. 10. Here it appears that the women were as forward in the good work as the men. They were not only willing to *give*, but to *make*. They not only resigned their

27 And \* the rulers brought onyx-stones, and stones to be set, for the ephod, and for the breast-plate;

28 And yspice, and oil for the light, and for the anointing oil, and for the sweet incense.

29 The children of Israel brought a z willing offering unto the LORD, every man and woman, whose heart made them willing to bring, for all manner of work which the LORD had commanded to be made by the hand of Moses.

30 ¶ And Moses said unto the children of Israel, See, a the LORD

<sup>x</sup> 1 Chron. 29. 6. Ezra 2. 68. <sup>y</sup> ch. 30. 23. <sup>z</sup> ver 21. 1 Chron. 29. 9. <sup>a</sup> ch. 31. 2, &c.

ornaments, but went immediately to work by spinning and weaving to fabricate such articles of tapestry as were needed for the tabernacle. As all are interested in the worship of God, so all should bear a part in it. The well-being and happiness of woman is in a special manner vitally involved in the existence and maintenance of religious institutions, and why should she not be active in promoting them? So in the early history of the church, the Christian tabernacle, there were 'women which labored in the gospel,' Phil. 4. 3, and of whom Paul again says, Rom. 16. 12, that they 'labored in the Lord.'

29. *The children of Israel brought a willing offering, every man and woman, &c.* Heb. נְדָבָה *nedabah*, a free-will gift. The same word is rendered in v. 3, of the ensuing chapter, 'free-offering.' No other impulse was needed than the generous promptings of their own bosoms to draw from them the most liberal donations to the good work in hand. Even the maidens, who are not prone to forget their ornaments, now readily divested themselves of their bracelets, pendants, and jewels to swell the amount of the general contribution, as if more anxious for the beautifying of the sanctuary than the



hath called by name Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah;

31 And he hath filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship;

32 And to devise curious works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass,

33 And in the cutting of stones, to set *them*, and in carving of wood, to make any manner of cunning work.

34 And he hath put in his heart that he may teach, *both* he, and <sup>b</sup>Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan.

<sup>b</sup> ch. 31. 6.

decoration of their own persons. One spirit seems to have pervaded the whole people. Whatever any one possessed that could be applied to the projected structure, he instantly wrote upon it 'Corban,' and dedicated it to the service of God. Each doubtless thought himself rich, not in proportion to what he retained for his own use, but to the supplies he was able to contribute. In this way the genuine influence of the gospel always operates. Its converts in every age are represented as coming unto God, 'their gold and their silver with them.' However dear may have been their earthly treasures to their hearts, yet the love of Christ will relax their tenacious grasp upon them, and they will be willing, at the call of duty, to part with that which they most value, and deem it a privilege to give up their *all* to him who has bought them with his blood. How little is to be lost by a liberal policy and how heartily we are to adopt it, is clearly taught in the words of Paul, 2 Cor. 9. 6, 7, 'But this I say, he which soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully, shall reap also boun-

35 Them hath he <sup>c</sup>filled with wisdom of heart, to work all manner of work, of the engraver, and of the cunning workman, and of the embroiderer, in blue, and in purple, in scarlet, and in fine linen, and of the weaver, *even* of them that do any work, and of those that devise cunning work.

#### CHAPTER XXXVI.

**T**HEN wrought Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every <sup>a</sup>wise-hearted man, in whom the LORD put wisdom and understanding to know how to work all manner of work for the service of the <sup>b</sup>sanctuary, according to all that the LORD had commanded.

<sup>c</sup> ver. 31. ch. 31. 3, 6. 1 Kings 7. 14. 2 Chron. 2. 14. Isai. 28. 26. <sup>a</sup> ch. 28. 3. & 31. 6. & 35. 10, 35. <sup>b</sup> ch. 25. 8.

tifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.' O what might not be done for the honor of God and the welfare of man, if this noble spirit every where prevailed, and men gave to the utmost of their ability! How easy would it be to erect places of worship, to maintain a settled ministry, to supply the wants of the poor, to send the gospel to the heathen, to administer instruction to the ignorant, consolation to the troubled, relief to the distressed! Well may it shame the world and the church that a concern for trifles crowds out these great objects from their minds; that their own petty interests take precedence of the infinite and eternal interests of God and his kingdom!

#### CHAPTER XXXVI.

1. *Then wrought Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man, &c.* Heb. **לֵב חָכָם לֵב** *hakem lēb*, *wise of heart*. Wherever this epithet occurs the reader is to consider it as an Hebraism, even though it should be met with in the New Testament, as 1 Cor. 3. 10, 'Ac-

2 And Moses called Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man, in whose heart the LORD had put wisdom, *even every one* <sup>c</sup> whose heart stirred him up to come unto the work to do it:

3 And they received of Moses all the offering which the children of Israel <sup>d</sup> had brought for the work of the service of the sanctuary, to make it *withal*. And they brought yet unto him free-offerings every morning.

4 And all the wise men, that wrought all the work of the sanctuary, came every man from his work which they made;

5 ¶ And they spake unto Moses, saying, <sup>e</sup> The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work which the LORD commanded to make.

6 And Moses gave commandment, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing.

7 For the stuff they had was sufficient for all the work to make it, and too much.

<sup>e</sup> 2 Cor. 8. 2, 3.

<sup>c</sup> ch. 35. 2, 26. 1 Chron. 29. 5. <sup>d</sup> ch. 35. 27.

cording to the grace of God which is given unto me as a *wise* master-builder, I have laid the foundation.' Strictly speaking, a man may be replete with wisdom, and yet be a poor artificer; and here perhaps a better version would have been 'ingenious,' 'skilful,' or some such term; or 'wise-hearted' may be exchanged for 'wise-minded,' as 'heart,' in the modern acceptation, is the seat neither of wisdom, nor skill, nor ingenuity; but of love, hatred, pride, revenge, and other similar passions; whereas in the *mind* lodges not only wisdom, properly so called, but prudence, foresight, genius, contrivance, invention, and other kindred faculties. Our previous explanations, however, on the scriptural sense of this epithet have been too full to leave the reader under any mistake as to its meaning.

2. *And Moses called, &c.* Rather, 'For Moses *had* called,' according to very common usage.

3. *And they received of Moses all the offering, &c.* Heb. כל התרומה *kol hatterumah*, all the heaving, or heave-offering.—¶ *And they brought yet unto him free-offerings every morning.* Heb. בקר בקר *boker boker*, morning, morning. They kept it up from day to

day, and how long they would have gone on, if not restrained, no one can tell. But we are not left merely to *admire* their conduct. 'We should always make it our morning's work to bring our offering unto the Lord, even the spiritual offerings of prayer and praise, and a broken heart surrendered entirely to God. This is that which the duty of every day requires. God's compassions are new every morning, and so should our offerings be, our free offerings: God's grace to us is free, and so should our duty to him be.' *Henry*.

4—7. *And all the wise men—came every man from his work, &c.* The 'wise men' here mentioned were evidently the *artificers* or *artisans* who took charge of the different departments of the work. Although their several tasks were not yet completed, yet from the best judgment they could form of the amount of materials requisite, they did not hesitate to assure Moses that the supply exceeded the demand. This report was alike creditable to the artists and to the people. It showed conclusively the exemplary honesty of the former. Had they been governed by any thing but the strictest principles of integrity, they would scarcely have

8 ¶ And every wise-hearted man among them that wrought the work of the tabernacle made ten

f ch. 26. 1.

failed to seize the opportunity of enriching themselves by appropriating the overplus of the offerings to their own use as perquisites of their place. When we consider that it was impossible to determine beforehand precisely how large an amount of materials would be necessary for any particular province of the work, and how desirous most men are of having the handling and the discretionary control of precious things, though they may not actually use them, it was certainly a rare example of disinterestedness and probity that was now exhibited. With every thing to favor speculation, they scorn to entertain the thought for a moment of turning the public liberality to their private advantage. On the contrary, they determine to cut themselves off from a liability to temptation by declining to receive any more than they were confident of having occasion for. Accordingly upon their statement to Moses he immediately issued his command in a proclamation that the contributions should cease. Here again it is impossible to conceive a more emphatic testimony than this to the profuse generosity of the people. 'Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary!' Moses might well adopt the language of Paul respecting the churches of Macedonia; 'Their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power, I bear record, yea, and beyond their power, they were willing of themselves; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift.' It would almost seem that they had heard 'the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.' Alas, are we not constrained to acknowledge that this con-

duct stands in mortifying contrast with that of the great mass of the Christian world! Instead of giving 'too much,' where do they ever give enough? And where do we now find men acting so fully on the *voluntary* principle? How small a proportion of the benevolent offerings of Christians are *brought* to the Lord's treasury? Instead of this they must be *sent for*. Numerous, expensive, and laborious agencies must be employed, which of themselves absorb a considerable portion of the funds raised. Collectors must go from house to house, and even then are often esteemed unwelcome visitors; nay, so prone is the worldly heart to evasion, that many will consider it a good excuse for not giving to a well-known object of benevolence, if they can say, *they have not been called on!* Ah, how different from the full-souled and spontaneous promptings of the Israelitish donors on this occasion! They needed simply to have a want stated, and then without waiting for duty to be inculcated, appeals urged, a precise amount prescribed, or a messenger sent, they become the carriers of their own gifts and pour them in without stint till checked by a public proclamation! God be praised, however, that this spirit is not entirely lacking in the church at this day. Some there are who only require the slightest signal of the Lord's finger, not to be behind the most forward Israelite in contributing to the up-building of his kingdom on the earth. Their record is on high.

—¶ *Make any more work.* That is collect, accumulate, make ready any more materials to work with. See this sense of the word 'make' illustrated in the Note on Gen. 12. 5.

8—38. *Made ten curtains of fine*

9 The length of one curtain *was* twenty and eight cubits, and the breadth of one curtain four cubits: the curtains *were* all of one size.

10 And he coupled the five curtains one unto another: and *the other* five curtains he coupled one unto another.

11 And he made loops of blue on the edge of one curtain from the selvedge in the coupling: likewise he made in the uttermost side of *another* curtain, in the coupling of the second.

12 <sup>g</sup> Fifty loops made he in one curtain, and fifty loops made he in the edge of the curtain which *was* in the coupling of the second: the loops held one *curtain* to another.

13 And he made fifty taches of gold, and coupled the curtains one unto another with the taches. So it became one tabernacle.

14 ¶ <sup>h</sup> And he made curtains of goats' hair for the tent over the tabernacle: eleven curtains he made them.

15 The length of one curtain *was* thirty cubits, and four cubits *was* the breadth of one curtain: the eleven curtains *were* of one size.

16 And he coupled five curtains by themselves, and six curtains by themselves.

17 And he made fifty loops upon

<sup>g</sup> ch. 26. 5. <sup>h</sup> ch. 26. 7.

*twined linen*, &c. We find scarcely any thing in the sequel of this chapter but what has been mentioned and fully commented on in preceding Notes. Both this and the remaining chapters of the book are little more than a bare repetition of the contents of the previous chapters from ch. 25th to 31st inclusive. We shall find nothing to surprise or weary us in this extended recital of minute circumstances, if we bear in mind, that it is doubtless intended as a *tacit* intimation to us of the duty of ful-

the uttermost edge of the curtain in the coupling, and fifty loops made he upon the edge of the curtain which coupled the second.

18 And he made fifty taches of brass to couple the tent together, that it might be one.

19 <sup>i</sup> And he made a covering for the tent of rams' skins dyed red, and a covering of badgers' skins above *that*.

20 ¶ <sup>k</sup> And he made boards for the tabernacle of shittim-wood, standing up.

21 The length of a board *was* ten cubits, and the breadth of a board one cubit and a half.

22 One board had two tenons, equally distant one from another: thus did he make for all the boards of the tabernacle.

23 And he made boards for the tabernacle; twenty boards for the south side southward:

24 And forty sockets of silver he made under the twenty boards; two sockets under one board for his two tenons, and two sockets under another board for his two tenons.

25 And for the other side of the tabernacle *which is* toward the north corner, he made twenty boards,

26 And their forty sockets of

<sup>i</sup> ch. 26. 14. <sup>k</sup> ch. 26. 15.

filling to the letter, and with the most scrupulous exactness, every jot and tittle of the word of God. Of this the narrative before us affords so striking an instance, that it may well stand as a grand and paramount illustration of a general principle. Indeed it may be said, that the whole mass of Scripture consists chiefly of two corresponding parts, viz., *precept* and *example*; on the one hand the directions as to what we are to do to fulfil the divine will, and on the other, the example of those who

silver; two sockets under one board, and two sockets under another board.

27 And for the sides of the tabernacle westward he made six boards.

28 And two boards made he for the corners of the tabernacle in the two sides.

29 And they were coupled beneath, and coupled together at the head thereof, to one ring: thus he did to both of them in both the corners.

30 And there were eight boards; and their sockets *were* sixteen sockets of silver, under every board two sockets.

31 ¶ And he made <sup>1</sup>bars of shittim-wood; five for the boards of the one side of the tabernacle,

32 And five bars for the boards of the other side of the tabernacle, and five bars for the boards of the tabernacle for the sides westward.

33 And he made the middle bar to shoot through the boards from the one end to the other.

34 And he overlaid the boards

<sup>1</sup> ch. 26. 26.

have actually fulfilled it. The comparison of the two cannot but be admonitory to us, that in all things we are to work for God according to the pattern shown to us. In all our conduct, whether it be in the world's estimation a great matter or a small, it is of the first importance that there be neither a nail nor a pin, a loop nor a hook, otherwise than God has commanded. To do his will makes every matter great. Nothing can be a trifle that promotes his glory. 'Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find *so doing*' as he hath ordered.

#### CHAPTER XXXVII.

There is little in the present chapter

with gold, and made their rings *of gold to be* places for the bars, and overlaid with bars of gold.

35 ¶ And he made <sup>a</sup>a vail of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen: *with cherubims* made he it of cunning work.

36 And he made thereunto four pillars of shittim-wood, and overlaid them with gold: their hooks *were of* gold; and he cast for them four sockets of silver.

37 ¶ And he made a <sup>n</sup>hanging for the tabernacle-door of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, of needle-work;

38 And the five pillars of it, with their hooks: and he overlaid their chapiters and their fillets with gold: but their five sockets *were of* brass.

#### CHAPTER XXXVII.

AND Bezaleel made <sup>a</sup>the ark of shittim-wood: two cubits and a half *was* the length of it, and a cubit and a half the breadth of it, and a cubit and a half the height of it:

<sup>m</sup> ch. 26. 31. <sup>n</sup> ch. 26. 36. <sup>a</sup> ch. 25. 10.

that requires additional exposition. We have already considered its various items in minute detail in our remarks upon the previous chapters. The execution of each particular part, in exact conformity with the directions given, is punctiliously recited, not only for the general reason mentioned above, but also to intimate with what serious and profound consideration the form, furniture, uses, and typical design of this remarkable structure deserved to be studied. We can scarcely suppose that so much space would have been allotted to it, had it not been intended to shadow forth some of the central mysteries of redemption. What these were we have endeavored partially to unfold in our previous annotations. How far they

2 And he overlaid it with pure gold within and without, and made a crown of gold to it round about.

3 And he cast for it four rings of gold, *to be set* by the four corners

of it: even two rings upon the one side of it, and two rings upon the other side of it.

4 And he made staves of shittim-wood, and overlaid them with gold.

were or could he understood by Moses and his cotemporaries, it is not easy to determine; but as the finer ornaments of the tabernacle were not to be seen by the common people, but only by the priests, and as the Scriptures were intended for the people at large, we can see a peculiar propriety in the verbal description being given at great length. In the same manner, many of the events in the life of Christ are in the New Testament related by two, and three, and some by four of the Evangelists, for the same reason.

For the ensuing extended note on a point of antiquarian interest, we have drawn upon the treasures of the Pictorial Bible.

2. *He overlaid it with pure gold.*

Heb. *צפה* *tzippah*. 'The question here arises whether here and elsewhere gilding, or actual overlaying with plates of metal, is intended. It is observable that the word 'gilding' never occurs in our translation, but 'overlaying' often; and yet there is no reason to question that the Hebrews were at some time or other acquainted with gilding, and it is therefore difficult to conclude that in all cases where the word *צפה* *tzaphah* occurs it means only overlaid with plates of metal; and this may be the rather questioned, since the Septuagint renders it by *καταχρυσω*, *to gild*, and is followed in this by the Vulgate. Modern translators have, however, generally adopted the ambiguous expression, 'to overlay;' yet one of them, Michaelis, uses the term 'to gild' in application to the boards of the tabernacle. When Beckmann was writing his article on gilding, he applied to Professor Tychsen to furnish him with some information as to the Scriptural notices on the

subject. The professor, in his reply, states the instances in which gilding or overlaying are mentioned. They are, in the works of the tabernacle:—the ark, which was covered with gold within and without, and also the staves which belonged to it—the table of shew-bread, with its staves—the altar of burnt incense—the boards which formed the sides and the west end of the tabernacle; these were forty-eight in number, each having a surface of about forty-three feet and a half: besides which, there were the five bars on each side, which bound the whole together, and the pillars at the east end, which were also overlaid with gold. Then in Solomon's temple, the parts overlaid with gold were:—the whole inside of the house (1 Kings, 6. 21, 22): the altar of incense (ver. 20—22): the wooden cherubim, above seventeen feet in height (ver. 28): the floor (ver. 30): the doors of the oracle, on which were carved cherubim, palm-trees, and open flowers, so that the covering gold accurately exhibited the figures of the carved work (ver. 32—35). 'Now,' proceeds the professor, 'the question is, whether all these were gilt, or covered, or overlaid with plates of gold. I am acquainted with no work in which this subject is professedly discussed, and therefore I submit the following remarks to your consideration: The expression continually used for overlaying is *צפה* *tzaphah*, the original meaning of which in the Arabic, *تظاف* *tzapha*, *clear, to be bright*, seems still to remain. The signification therefore is, *to make clear, to render bright*; but, as is commonly the case, nothing decisive can be obtained from this etymology, for it is equally applicable to gilding as to overlaying with

5 And he put the staves into the rings by the sides of the ark, to bear the ark.

6 ¶ And he made the <sup>b</sup>mercy-seat of pure gold: two cubits and a half *was* the length thereof, and one cubit and a half the breadth thereof.

7 And he made two cherubims of gold, beaten out of one piece made he them, on the two ends of the mercy-seat;

8 One cherub on the end on this side, and another cherub on the *other* end on that side: out of the mercy-seat made he the cherubims on the two ends thereof.

9 And the cherubims spread out *their* wings on high, and covered with their wings over the mercy-seat, with their faces one to another; *even* to the mercy-seat-ward were the faces of the cherubims.

10 ¶ And he made <sup>c</sup>the table of shittim wood: two cubits *was* the length thereof, and a cubit the breadth thereof, and a cubit and a half the height thereof:

<sup>b</sup> ch. 25. 17. <sup>c</sup> ch. 25. 23.

gold.' In some following observations the professor omits to avail himself of the important corroboration of his own view (that the word translated 'to overlay' means only 'to render bright'), which is afforded by the fact, that when overlaying is undoubtedly intended, as in overlaying the altar of burnt-offering with plates of copper, quite another word is used, נִחְשֶׁת *nehosheth*, than that which refers to the covering of the wood-work with gold. Upon the whole, Tychsen concludes, from a comparison of the different passages, that gilding is sometimes intended rather than overlaying with plates of metal. He considers that the drying of the wood, and the softness of gold, which, in regard to staves, floors, &c., would soon be rubbed off, occasions some difficulty in

11 And he overlaid it with pure gold, and made thereunto a crown of gold round about.

12 Also he made thereunto a border of an hand-breadth round about; and made a crown of gold for the border thereof round about.

13 And he cast for it four rings of gold, and put the rings upon the four corners that *were* in the four feet thereof.

14 Over against the border were the rings, the places for the staves to bear the table.

15 And he made the staves of shittim-wood, and overlaid them with gold, to bear the table.

16 And he made the vessels which *were* upon the table, his <sup>d</sup>dishes, and his spoons, and his bowls, and his covers to cover withal, of pure gold.

17 ¶ And he made the <sup>e</sup>candlestick of pure gold; of beaten work made he the candlestick; his shaft, and his branch, his bowls, his knops, and his flowers were of the same:

<sup>d</sup> ch. 25. 29. <sup>e</sup> ch. 25. 31.

the notion that plates of metal were employed; but even admitting that such plates could be made sufficiently fast to smooth surfaces of wood, he doubts whether any plates, however thin, could be so applied as to fit and exhibit accurately carved wooden figures and flower-work, as in 1 Kings, 6. 35. And, with regard to the parts of the tabernacle, had they been covered with plates of gold, would they not have been too heavy for transportation, particularly as several of them were to be carried on the shouldêrs of men? He also states his impression, that the twenty-nine talents and odd shekels of gold, could scarcely have been sufficient to cover with plates of gold all the articles above enumerated after so many vessels and other things had been made

18 And six branches going out of the sides thereof; three branches of the candlestick out of the one side thereof, and three branches of the candlestick out of the other side thereof:

19 Three bowls made after the fashion of almonds in one branch, a knop and a flower; and three bowls made like almonds in another branch, a knop and a flower: so throughout the six branches going out of the candlestick.

20 And in the candlestick were four bowls made like almonds, his knops and his flowers:

21 And a knop under two branches of the same, and a knop under two branches of the same, and a knop under two branches of the same, according to the six branches going out of it.

22 Their knops and their branches were of the same: all of it was one beaten work of pure gold.

23 And he made his seven lamps, and his snuffers, and his snuffdishes of pure gold.

24 Of a talent of pure gold made he it, and all the vessels thereof.

25 ¶ And he made the incense-altar of shittim-wood: the length of it was a cubit, and the breadth of it a cubit; it was four-square; and two cubits was the height of it; the horns thereof were of the same.

26 And he overlaid it with pure gold, both the top of it, and the sides thereof round about, and the horns of it: also he made unto it a crown of gold round about.

27 And he made two rings of gold for it under the crown thereof, by the two corners of it, upon the two sides thereof, to be places for the staves to bear it withal.

28 And he made the staves of shittim-wood and overlaid them with gold.

29 ¶ And he made the holy anointing oil, and the pure incense of sweet spices, according to the work of the apothecary.

f ch. 30. 1. g ch. 30. 23, 34.

with pure gold. Upon the whole, Professor Tychsen thinks that the Hebrews understood both the arts of gilding and of overlaying with plates of metal, and that we must be left to infer from analogy and probability which process of the two was employed in particular cases. Some of these arguments seem to us to deserve great attention, and we have little hesitation in allowing their application to the temple of Solomon in the instances to which Professor Tychsen adverts; and, although with somewhat more hesitation, we may allow that collateral considerations give some probability to their application even to a structure so much more ancient and so different as the tabernacle. One of these considerations is, that gilding did not in ancient times imply as much inferiority to overlaying with plates as at

present; for the ancient gold-beaters had not the art of reducing the gold-leaf to any thing like the tenuity which may now be produced, and hence the ancient gilding was thick, durable, and rich. Another is, that the art of gilding was of very high antiquity in Egypt, although it is of course impossible to say that the art existed there previous to the exodus of the Israelites. Herodotus mentions Egyptian statues ornamented with gilding; and he also mentions that he saw in the palace at Sais a cow of richly gilded wood, which had been made, in times long anterior to his own, by Mycerinus (the son of Cleops, the pyramid-builder) to enclose the mummy of his daughter. Even at this day we find traces of gilding on mummies and mummy-cases, and in some instances the mummies appear to have



## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

AND <sup>a</sup>he made the altar of burnt-offering of shittim-wood: five cubits *was* the length thereof, and five cubits the breadth thereof; *it was* four-square; and three cubits the height thereof.

2 And he made the horns thereof on the four corners of it; the horns thereof were of the same: and he overlaid it with brass.

3 And he made all the vessels of the altar, the pots, and the shovels, and the basons, *and* the flesh-hooks, and the fire-pans: all the vessels thereof made he of brass.

4 And he made for the altar a brazen grate of net-work under the

<sup>a</sup> ch. 27. 1.

been gilt all over. (See 'Egyptian Antiquities,' vol. ii. p. 144.) Goguet thinks, indeed, that gilding was not known to the Greeks in the time of Homer. We do not feel that this position is fairly established by the instance he adduces; and if it were so, it is not only easy to conceive, but is certainly true, that the Egyptians had at that time long been acquainted with many arts which were not yet known to the Greeks. Goguet's instance is, that when the heifer which Nestor was about to offer to Minerva had, according to custom, its horns ornamented with gold, the process followed by the operator, who came with anvil, hammer, and pincers, is evidently not that of gilding, but of overlaying with plates of metal. (See 'Origine des Lois,' t. 2. p. 209.)' *Pictorial Bible*.

## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

8. *He made the laver of brass—of the looking-glasses of the women assembling, &c.* 'As the laver was of brass or copper, it is evident that the 'looking-glasses,' with which it was made, were of the same metal. The word 'mirror' should have been used in the

compass thereof beneath unto the midst of it.

5 And he cast four rings for the four ends of the grate of brass, *to be* places for the staves.

6 And he made the staves of shittim-wood, and overlaid them with brass.

7 And he put the staves into the rings on the sides of the altar, to bear it withal; he made the altar hollow with boards.

8 ¶ And he made <sup>b</sup>the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the looking-glasses of *the women assembling*, which assembled *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

<sup>b</sup> ch. 30. 18.

place of 'looking-glass,' in the various passages where it occurs, and which are all incompatible with the idea of glass. Thus Job (chap. 37. 18), 'Hast thou with him spread out the sky, which is strong, and *as a molten looking-glass?*' and an apocryphal writer (Ecclus. 12. 11.) says, 'Thou shalt be unto him as if thou hadst wiped *a looking-glass*, and thou shalt know that his *rust* hath not been altogether wiped away.' In all these passages a metallic mirror is obviously intended. The word מְרִאתַם *maroth*, considered to denote mirrors in the present text, does not, however, any where else occur in that sense, and Dr. Boothroyd, taking it in its most usual sense, considers the text to mean that the laver was made *under the inspection* of the women, not *with their mirrors*. This explanation seems to us to involve greater difficulties than those which it is designed to obviate. The common translation is perfectly consistent with the context, and with the early history of mirrors; besides which, all the ancient versions, as well as the Jewish writers, understand mirrors to be intended. We may understand either that the stock of copper in the camp

was so comparatively small, as to have been exhausted in the other works for the tabernacle, or else that the mirrors of the women were particularly required for the laver as being of a superior sort of metal. As the women who assembled at the tabernacle are especially mentioned, it is not improbable that they followed the example of the Egyptian women who took their mirrors with them when they went to the temples. Moses may have required them for the laver, in order to put a stop to a practice of which he did not approve.


'Artificial mirrors seem to have been made as soon as men began to exercise their ingenuity on metals and stones. Every solid body capable of receiving a polish would be more or less suitable for this purpose; hence the earliest mirrors of which we possess any information were of metal. Stone mirrors are also noticed very early; but as such mirrors could not have been in any degree equal to those of polished metal, they are rarely mentioned by ancient authors, and then seem to be chiefly used for purposes of ornament, being polished slabs or panels fixed in the walls of wainscoted apartments. For this purpose the Romans preferred what Pliny calls the obsidian stone, which Beckmann identifies with the species of vitrified lava now called Icelandic agate. Plane, concave, and convex mirrors of a similar substance were in use among the Americans when the Spaniards came among them; and they had also others made with a mineral called the Inca's stone, which seems to have been a compact marcasite or pyrites, susceptible of a fine polish, and calculated to form mirrors apparently superior to any of stone which the ancient nations of Europe and Asia seem to have possessed. The Americans had also mirrors of silver, copper, and brass. When men began to work metals, it must soon have been discovered that the hardest white metals reflected more

distinct images, when polished, than any others. Of all the metals known to the ancients, steel was the best calculated for the purpose; but Beckmann says that he can discover no indications that steel mirrors were in use among them; and he thinks that its liability to contract rust and to become tarnished, prevented this otherwise desirable metal from being employed for the purpose. We rather differ from him in this particular. The mention of *rust* in the above quotation from the Apocrypha seems to imply that the mirror there in view was of steel; and although it be true that the Greeks and Romans did not use such mirrors, it does not follow that they were not employed in the East, where, in most parts, the dryness of the atmosphere exposes polished steel to the least possible danger from rust. In fact steel mirrors, although in some degree superseded by looking-glasses, continue to be extensively used in the East. After steel, in eligibility for mirrors, comes silver; and we find that silver mirrors are those most generally mentioned among the Greeks and Romans. 'In the Roman code of laws,' says Beckmann, 'when silver plate is mentioned, under the heads of heirship and succession by propinquity, silver mirrors are rarely omitted; and Pliny, Seneca, and other writers, who inveigh against luxury, tell us, ridiculing the extravagance of that age, that every young woman in their time must have a silver mirror. These polished silver plates may however have been very slight, for all the ancient mirrors preserved in collections, which I have seen, are only covered with a thin coat of that expensive metal.' There was also in use for the same purpose a mixture of copper and tin, producing a white metal which would seem to have been better adapted for mirrors than silver, although, on some account or other, it was not so much esteemed for the purpose. One reason probably was, that

this metal was more liable to be tarnished than those of silver, requiring to be frequently brightened before being used. Hence it seems that a sponge with pounded pumice-stone was generally suspended near the ancient mirrors. Mirrors of copper, brass, and gold, do not appear to have been much in use after the superior fitness of silver was discovered; yet there is no question that copper and brass were soonest applied to this purpose, and doubtless continued to be used by those who could not afford silver or silvered mirrors. The use of metallic mirrors is now, in Europe, almost entirely confined to reflecting telescopes. The mode of compounding the metals of which these mirrors are made, and of polishing them of a proper form, is an art of great nicety.

There is some difficulty in determining when glass mirrors were invented. Pliny alludes to attempts made at Sidon to form mirrors with glass, but in what manner does not appear; and if the attempts had produced any approximation to our mirrors, they would surely have

superseded those of metal, which they were so far from doing that, whatever they were, they never came into use. With the exception of this notice in Pliny, there is no trace of glass mirrors till the thirteenth century, after which they are spoken of in the clearest manner, and continued to be mentioned in every century, and at last mirrors of metal passed entirely out of notice. That the practical invention of glass mirrors cannot be much earlier than the date here assigned, seems to be evinced by the fact, mentioned by Beckmann, that glass mirrors continued to be very scarce in France in the fourteenth century. Those of metal were still in common use, and the mirror of even the queen, Anne of Bretagne, consort of Louis XII., was of this description.—On the history of mirrors, see further in Beckmann's '*Hist. of Inventions*,' vol. iii. See also Goguet, '*Origine des Lois*,' t. i. p. 371; Harmer vol. iv. p. 332—334; Burder's '*Oriental Customs*,' vol. i. p. 37; vol. ii. p. 52, &c. *Pict. Bib.*



ANCIENT EGYPTIAN MIRRORS.

9 ¶ And he made <sup>c</sup> the court : on the south side southward the hangings of the court *were of fine twined linen, a hundred cubits :*

10 Their pillars *were* twenty, and their brazen sockets twenty; the hooks of the pillars, and their fillets, *were of silver.*

11 And for the north side, *the hangings were* an hundred cubits, their pillars *were* twenty, and their sockets of brass twenty: the hooks of the pillars, and their fillets, *of silver.*

12 And for the west side *were* hangings of fifty cubits, their pillars ten, and their sockets ten; the hooks of the pillars, and their fillets, *of silver.*

<sup>c</sup> ch. 27. 9.

¶ *Assembling.* Heb. **תְּצַבֵּה** *tzobeoth* *assembling in troops.* The Heb. word here rendered 'assembling' is properly a military term applied to the *orderly mustering or marshalling of an army.* The verb from which it is derived, **צָבָה** *tzaba*, has the signification of *warring or going forth upon a military expedition*, and the corresponding substantive is for the most part rendered 'host,' 'hosts;' sometimes 'war,' or 'warfare.' But as the regularity and order which marked the services of the sanctuary resembled those which prevail in a well-disciplined army, one party succeeding and relieving another in the discharge of their appropriate duties, the term became at length applied to the orderly course of ministration in the matter of the worship of God, as may be seen from the following passages; Num. 4. 23, 'All that enter in to perform the service (**לְעִצְבָּה צָבָה**) *litzbo tzaba*, to war the warfare;') i. e. perform the service, to do the work of the tabernacle; Gr. *λειτουργεῖν*, to minister. Num. 8. 24, 'From twenty and five years old and upward they will go in to wait upon the service (**לְעִצְבָּה צָבָה**) *litzbo tzaba*, to war

13 And for the east side eastward fifty cubits.

14 The hangings of the one side *of the gate were* fifteen cubits; their pillars three and their sockets three.

15 And for the other side of the court-gate, on this hand and that hand, *were* hangings of fifteen cubits; their pillars three, and their sockets three.

16 All the hangings of the court round about *were of fine twined linen.*

17 And the sockets for the pillars *were of brass;* the hooks of the pillars, and their fillets, *of silver;* and the overlaying of their chapiters *of silver;* and all the pillars of the court *were filleted with silver.*

*the warfare*) of the tabernacle.' So with probably a like sense Paul says to Timothy, 'that thou mightest *war a good warfare*;' as if it were a usual phrase to signify the service of God. In the present instance accordingly we suppose the word is applied to certain women of the congregation who had devoted themselves, from the promptings of a peculiar spirit of piety, to various functions pertaining to the tabernacle service, for the same or a similar reason to that for which the term is applied to men when busied in the like employment. In strict parallelism with this we find the word occurring 1 Sam. 2. 22. 'And how they lay with the women that *assembled* (**הַתְּצַבֵּה** *hatz-tzobeoth*) at the door of the congregation; i. e. who were convened there as female ministers for pious purposes. So it is said of Anna, the prophetess, Luke 2. 26, that she 'departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day.' With this mode of interpretation—the assembling for purposes of pious ministry—several of the ancient versions strikingly accord. Thus, the Chal. 'Of the mir-

18 And the hanging for the gate of the court *was* needle-work, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen: and twenty cubits *was* the length, and the height in the breadth *was* five cubits answerable to the hangings of the court.

19 And their pillars *were* four, and their sockets of brass four; their hooks of silver, and the overlaying of their chapiters and their fillets of silver.

20 And all the <sup>d</sup> pins of the tabernacle, and of the court round about, *were* of brass.

21 ¶ This is the sum of the tabernacle, *even* of <sup>e</sup> the tabernacle of testimony, as it was counted, according to the commandment of Moses, for the service of the Levites, <sup>f</sup> by the hand of Ithamar, son to Aaron the priest.

<sup>d</sup> ch. 27. 19. <sup>e</sup> Numb. 1. 50. 53. & 9. 15. & 10. 11. A 17. 7, 8. & 18. 2. <sup>2</sup> Chron. 24. 6. Acts 7. 44. <sup>f</sup> Numb. 4. 28. 33.

rors of the women which came to pray at the door of the tabernacle.' Gr. 'Of the women that *fasted*, which *fasted* at the door of the tabernacle of witness.' *Fasting* is here specified because it was a usual accompaniment of *praying*. Targ. Jon. 'Of the brazen mirrors of modest women, who, when they came to pray in the portal of the tabernacle stood by their heave-offering, and offered praises and made confessions.'

18. *The height in the breadth was five cubits.* The phrase is Hebraic, denoting the height of the hanging of the gate, which was five cubits, corresponding with that of the rest of the hangings of the court. Suppose this piece of tapestry, which was twenty cubits in length, to be lying spread out upon the ground; it is evident that what constitutes its *breadth* in this situation becomes its *height* when hung up; and this is what is meant by the text. Its height as composed of its breadth was five cubits.

22 And <sup>g</sup> Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, made all that the Lord commanded Moses.

23 And with him *was* Aholiab, son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan, an engraver, and a cunning workman, and an embroiderer in blue, and in purple, and in scarlet, and fine linen.

24 All the gold that was occupied for the work in all the work of the holy *place*, even the gold of the offering, was twenty and nine talents, and seven hundred and thirty shekels after <sup>h</sup> the shekel of the sanctuary.

25 And the silver of them that were numbered of the congregation *was* a hundred talents, and a thousand seven hundred and threescore and fifteen shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary:

<sup>g</sup> ch. 31. 2, 6. <sup>h</sup> ch. 30. 13, 24. Lev. 5. 15. & 27. 3, 25. Numb. 3. 47. & 18. 16.

21. *This is the sum of the tabernacle.* That is, the sum, enumeration, or inventory of the various particulars of the tabernacle furniture. These were reckoned up by the Levites over whom Ithamar, the son of Aaron, presided. In the clause, 'for the service of the Levites,' the word 'for' does not occur in the original, and the meaning probably is, that it was counted *by the labor* or *ministry* of the Levites. The words are a preface to what follows extending to the end of the chapter.

24. *And all the gold, &c.* Although the tabernacle, as a *portable* structure, cannot, from its known proportions and general appearance, have been a very grand or imposing structure, yet we may safely say, that probably the world never saw so small a fabric composed of such rich materials, and reared at so vast a cost. As the quantities of the precious metals employed are stated, some idea of its surpassing richness may be formed. The *gold* weighed 29

26 <sup>i</sup> A bekah for every man, *that* half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for every one that went to be numbered, from twenty years old and upward, for <sup>k</sup> six hundred thousand and three thousand and five hundred and fifty *men*.

27 And of the hundred talents of silver were cast <sup>l</sup> the sockets of the

<sup>i</sup> ch. 30. 13, 15. <sup>k</sup> Numb. 1. 46. <sup>l</sup> ch. 26. 9, 21, 25, 32.

talents and 730 shekels, if we allow 3000 shekels to the talent of 125 lbs.; and this at £4 the ounce would be equal to £175,000 sterling, or nearly \$877,000. The silver was 100 talents and 1775 shekels, being a half shekel from all the males above twenty years of age when they came out of Egypt, whose number was 603,550; the whole value of this would, at 5s. the ounce, be £39,721, or nearly \$188,605. The *brass*, or rather *copper*, was 70 talents and 24,000 shekels, which if valued at 1s. 3d. the pound avoirdupois would be worth £138, or \$690. The amount of these several sums would not be less than £213,320, or \$1,066,600. But this amount does not include the curtains of the inclosure, the coverings of the tabernacle, the dress of the high priest and its jewels, the dresses of the common priests, or the value of the skill and labor employed in the work, the whole of which may be fairly taken to have raised its value to the immense sum of £250,000, or \$1,250,000!

It may perhaps be difficult for some to imagine how the Israelites should have been possessed of so much wealth in the desert. But it is to be recollected that they had come out of Egypt with great spoil, which was no doubt very much augmented by what they obtained from the dead bodies of their enemies, cast upon the shores of the Red Sea. The subsequent victory over the Amalekites, probably increased still further their predatory treasures. Add

sanctuary, and the sockets of the vail; a hundred sockets of the hundred talents, a talent for a socket.

28 And of the thousand seven hundred seventy and five *shekels* he made hooks for the pillars, and overlaid their chapiters, and filleted them.

29 And the brass of the offering was seventy talents, and two thousand and four hundred shekels.

to this, that there is no reason to question that they trafficked more or less with the wandering tribes of the desert, on their way to Canaan, though we are no where expressly informed that this was the case.

The grand reason for employing so great an amount of riches in the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture was undoubtedly two-fold, (1.) To impress the minds of the chosen people with the glory and dignity of the Divine Majesty, and the importance of his service; and (2.) To convey through the gorgeousness and splendor of the external ritual an intimation of the essential and transcendent beauty, excellence, and glory of the spiritual things that were shadowed out by it. In this there was a wise adaptation to the mental condition of the Israelites. They were in a sense like children, whose minds must be reached through the medium of their senses. But little capable of high abstract apprehensions of spiritual subjects, it was only by means of such a sensuous apparatus of worship that they could receive the inner essential truths which it involved. To us, favored as we are with a higher state of intellectual advancement, such a system is not necessary, and consequently it is done away.

26. *A bekah for every man.* The value of the bekah is immediately defined to be half a shekel. The original בקע *bekah* comes from באקע *baka*, to divide, to cleave, to separate into two. It

30 And therewith he made the sockets to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and the brazen altar, and the brazen grate for it, and all the vessels of the altar,

31 And the sockets of the court round about, and the sockets of the court-gate, and all the pins of the tabernacle, and all the pins of the court round about.

#### CHAPTER XXXIX.

AND of <sup>a</sup>the blue, and purple, and scarlet, they made <sup>b</sup>clothes of service, to do service in the holy

<sup>a</sup> ch. 35. 23. <sup>b</sup> ch. 31. 10. & 35. 19.

seems to signify, not a particular coin, but a shekel *broken* or *cut in two*. So, according to A. Clarke, the English penny was anciently cut into four parts, and the fourth part called a *fourthing*, corrupted into *farthing*.

#### CHAPTER XXXIX.

*The Work of the Tabernacle continued.*

I. *They made clothes of service.* This phrase is previously used, Ex. 31. 10, for the coverings which were thrown over or wrapped about the various articles of the sacred furniture, when the camp was removed. But it is here applied to the priestly garments, importing that they were not made for mere display, nor to be worn abroad, but only in the sanctuary. The ensuing clause, 'to do the service in the holy place,' is probably to be understood as determining the use of them to the one place and purpose for which they were intended, and for nothing else. 'Those upon whom honor is put, from them service is expected. It is said of those who are arrayed in white robes, Rev. 7. 13, 15, that 'they were before the throne and serve him day and night in his temple.' Henry.—¶ *As the Lord commanded Moses.* It is observable that all the six paragraphs from this to

place, and made the holy garments for Aaron; <sup>c</sup>as the Lord commanded Moses.

2 <sup>d</sup>And he made the ephod of gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen.

3 And they did beat the gold into thin plates, and cut *it into* wires, to work *it* in the blue, and in the purple, and in the scarlet, and in the fine linen, *with cunning work*.

4 The made shoulder-pieces for it, to couple *it* together: by the two edges was it coupled together.

5 And the curious girdle of his

<sup>c</sup> ch. 28. 4. <sup>d</sup> ch. 28. 6.

v. 31, giving an account of the making of the high priest's garments, conclude with these words. As this is not the case in the previous statements, it would seem that they had in the preparation of these articles a peculiarly strict regard to the divine appointment; and this was perhaps owing to the fact that the high priest in his appropriate dress was the most prominent type of Christ of any thing in the whole establishment.

3. *They did beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into wires.* We here again avail ourselves of the result of the researches of our usual guide in matters of this nature. 'This is the most ancient notice of the preparation of gold in wires, or extended threads to be interwoven in cloths, and it is quite in conformity with all the information we can collect from ancient writings on the subject. Works made with threads of metal are rarely mentioned at all, and whenever they are spoken of, the wire appears to have been wholly made on the anvil. The metals were beaten with a hammer into thin plates, then cut with a pair of scissors or other instrument, into narrow slips, which were afterwards rounded with the hammer and file, so as to form wires or threads. Most of this process is described in the

ephod, that *was* upon it, *was* of the same, according to the work thereof; of gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen; as the LORD commanded Moses.

text. A very similar process of fabrication is described by Homer as being used by Vulcan, who repaired to his forge and formed upon his anvil a net so fine, that it could be perceived by no one, not even by the gods, being more delicate than the web of a spider. Abating the hyperbole, we gather from this, as well as from the fact that the threads of metal were, in the instance before us, interwoven with, or employed to embroider cloths, that very fine wire was formed by this tedious and laborious process. It is not exactly clear how the gold threads were applied to ornament the ephod of the high priest. We rather think they were not interwoven in the cloth, as in ch. 35. 34, it seems to be said that the colors in the rich cloth were the work of the embroiderer as distinguished from the weaver, who is afterwards mentioned. So also the robe of the ephod, which was all of blue, is said to have been of woven work (v. 22.), probably to denote its simplicity. The same is also said of the innermost coat (v. 27.); while in speaking of the ephod, the girdles, &c., which were highly ornamented, embroidery and needlework are mentioned. Beckmann thinks that the earliest application of gold to dress was to sew on slips of the metal, particularly on the seams, as is now done with gold lace. As there is no mention in the text of any process subsequent to that of cutting the metallic plate into slips, necessarily flat, it is possible that they were embroidered on the dress or otherwise applied without being rounded into wires or threads. Beckmann supposes that gold stars and other figures cut from thin plates of the metal were very early applied to dresses, much in the same manner as

6 ¶ • And they wrought onyx-stones enclosed in ouches of gold, graven as signets are graven, with the names of the children of Israel.

• ch. 28. 9.

spangles at present, being either sewed to the cloth, or fastened by some adhesive composition. To this would seem to have succeeded the arts of embroidering and interweaving with threads of gold and ultimately the progress of uncomfortable luxury led to the formation of clothes entirely of threads of gold without any other material. This was indeed 'cloth of gold'—a name which in more modern times has been given to cloth, the threads of which are of silk wound about with silver wire flattened and gilded. Silver does not seem for a long time to have been employed for similar purposes, and accordingly it is not mentioned in Scripture as being so applied. Beckmann, in evidence of its being unknown at so comparatively late a period as the time of Aurelian, quotes a passage from Vopiscus, who states that this emperor was desirous of entirely abolishing the use of gold in gilding and weaving, because, though there was more gold than silver (this is in itself a curious fact), the former had become scarcer, as much of it was continually lost by being applied to such purposes, whereas every thing that was silver continued so. This seems to render it clear that silver was not used for such purposes. Yet, as Beckmann himself observes in a note, it is barely possible that Vopiscus speaks of gilt silver; for as the ancients were not acquainted with the art of separating these metals, the gold would be entirely lost when they melted the silver. He adds, however, that he had met with no passage in any ancient authors where weaving or embroidering in threads of gilt silver is mentioned. Neither have we. There is no notice of silver thread being interwoven in cloth ear-



7 And he put them on the shoulders of the ephod, *that they should be* stones for a memorial to the children of Israel; as the Lord commanded Moses.

8 ¶ And he made the breast-plate of cunning work, like the work of the ephod; of gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen.

9 It was four-square; they made the breast-plate double: a span was the length thereof, and a span the breadth thereof, *being* doubled.

10 <sup>h</sup> And they set in it four rows of stones: *the first* row was a sardius, a topaz, and a carbuncle: *this was* the first row.

f ch. 28. 12. g ch. 28. 15. h ch. 28. 17. &c.

lier than the times of the Greek later emperors.

‘It is really surprising to find so much use made of threads of precious metals while it continued to be formed by the hammer. Beckmann declares himself unable to determine when attempts were first made to draw into threads metal, cut or beat into small slips, by forcing them through holes in a steel plate placed perpendicularly on a table. But the art was not known in Italy in the time of Charlemagne; and our author, from the best evidence he was able to obtain, is disposed to attribute the invention of the drawing-plate to the fourteenth century. Since then the arts of forming and applying threads of gold have received much improvement. It is not known when wire first began to be spun round thread, as it now usually is in application to dress. This branch of the art is not ancient. The threads found among the ruins of Herculaneum are of massy gold. When the fine wire first began to be spun round the thread it was round; the art of first flattening the wire, by means of which tassels and other ornaments have been rendered much cheaper—in conse-

11 And the second row, an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond.

12 And the third row, a figure, an agate, and an amethyst.

13 And the fourth row, a beryl, an onyx, and a jasper: *they were* enclosed in ouches of gold in their enclosings.

14 And the stones *were* according to the names of the children of Israel, twelve, according to their names, *like* the engravings of a signet, every one with his name, according to the twelve tribes.

15 And they made upon the breast-plate chains at the ends, of wreathen work of pure gold.

16 And they made two ouches of gold, and two gold rings, and

quence of much less metal being required to cover the silk—and at the same time more brilliant and beautiful, is of modern but uncertain date. The different degrees of ductility of gold and silver have led to the beautiful invention of plating silver wire with gold.’ *Pict. Bible.*

6. *Onyx-stones enclosed in ouches of gold, graven as signets are graven.* ‘There can be no doubt but that mankind were at this time well acquainted with the art of polishing and engraving precious stones; and the various texts relating to the jewelled ornaments of Aaron’s dress are very interesting indications of the progress which had been made in lapidary and stone-engraving. It is to be observed, that the shoulders of the ephod were ornamented with two onyx-stones mounted on gold, and that these stones were engraved with the names of twelve tribes—six in each stone; and we may therefore suppose the work to have been of a rather minute character. Then from the breast-plate we learn that twelve other sorts of precious stones were known, as well as the brilliant effect which they would produce by a proper arrangement on the

put the two rings in the two ends of the breast-plate.

17 And they put the two wreathen chains of gold in the two rings on the ends of the breast-plate.

18 And the two ends of the two wreathen chains they fastened in the two ouches, and put them on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod, before it.

19 And they made two rings of gold, and put *them* on the two ends of the breast-plate, upon the border of it, which *was* on the side of the ephod inward.

20. And they made two *other* golden rings, and put them on the two sides of the ephod, underneath, toward the forepart of it, over against the *other* coupling thereof, above the curious girdle of the ephod:

21 And they did bind the breast-plate by his rings unto the rings of the ephod with a lace of blue, that it might be above the curious girdle

of the ephod, and that the breast-plate might not be loosed from the ephod; as the LORD commanded Moses.

22 ¶ <sup>i</sup> And he made the robe of the ephod *of* woven work, all *of* blue.

23 And *there was* a hole in the midst of the robe, as the hole of a habergeon, *with* a band round about the hole, that it should not rend.

24 And they made upon the hems of the robe pomegranates *of* blue, and purple, and scarlet, and *twined linen*.

25 And they made <sup>k</sup> bells *of* pure gold, and put the bells between the pomegranates upon the hem of the robe, round about between the pomegranates;

26 A bell and a pomegranate, a bell and a pomegranate, round about the hem of the robe to minister *in*; as the LORD commanded Moses.

<sup>i</sup> ch. 28. 31. <sup>k</sup> ch. 28. 33.

same surface. \* Each of these stones also contained the name of a tribe; and, altogether, we are led to form no mean idea of the progress which art had thus early made in the treatment of precious stones. Any one at all acquainted with the arts is well aware that the engraving of precious stones demands no common measure of address, precision, and knowledge. There must be a considerable number of very fine and delicate tools, and great decision of hand and practice. It is indeed true that the engraving of names admits of no comparison with the skill and delicacy of execution required in cutting the figures of men and animals; but still, as to the essentials of the art, the process is the same in both, and the difference is only a question of more or less perfection. Goguet is astonished to see that, in the time of Moses, and doubtless earlier, men had made so

much progress in art as to be able to execute such works. Considering the number of previous discoveries which it is necessary to suppose, as well as the degree of knowledge and attainment which it involves, the same author, not without reason, is disposed to regard the engraving of precious stones as a most marked evidence of the general progress which the arts had made, in certain countries, at a very early period. With regard to this particular branch of art, we may observe also, that in the course of time it attained such an advanced state among the ancients that the moderns have never been able to equal them in the exquisite delicacy and beauty of their performances on precious stones. The engraved gems which have been preserved are still the unapproached models of the art. *Pict. Bible.*

23. *As the hole of an habergeon.* The

27 ¶<sup>1</sup> And they made coats of fine linen, of woven work, for Aaron and for his sons,

28 <sup>m</sup> And a mitre of fine linen, and goodly bonnets of fine linen, and <sup>n</sup> linen breeches of fine twined linen.

29 <sup>o</sup> And a girdle of fine twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, of needle-work; as the LORD commanded Moses.

30 ¶<sup>p</sup> And they made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold, and wrote upon it writing, like to the engravings of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

31 And they tied unto it a lace of blue, to fasten it on high upon the mitre; as the LORD commanded Moses.

32 ¶ Thus was all the work of the tabernacle of the tent of the congregation finished: and the children of Israel did <sup>q</sup> according to all that the LORD commanded Moses, so did they.

33 ¶ And they brought the tabernacle unto Moses, the tent, and all his furniture, his taches, his boards, his bars, and his pillars, and his sockets;

<sup>1</sup> ch. 28. 39, 40. <sup>m</sup> ch. 28. 4, 39. Ezek. 44. 18. <sup>n</sup> ch. 28. 42. <sup>o</sup> ch. 28. 39. <sup>p</sup> ch. 28. 36, 37. <sup>q</sup> ver. 42, 43. ch. 25. 40.

*habergeon* or *hauberk* was a small coat of mail, made of little iron rings curiously united together. It covered the neck and breast, was very light, and resisted the stroke of a sword. The 'band' is what we should now call a *binding*.

27. *And they made coats of fine linen.* The order for making these coats is given above, ch. 28. 40, but the material is not there mentioned. Here they are said to have been made of fine linen, and there is good evidence that pure white linen garments were anciently used by all nations in the service of God. This usage the Most High was

34 And the covering of rams' skins dyed red, and the covering of badgers' skins, and the vail of the covering;

35 The ark of the testimony, and the staves thereof, and the mercy-seat;

36 The table, and all the vessels thereof, and the shew-bread;

37 The pure candlestick, with the lamps thereof, even with the lamps to be set in order, and all the vessels thereof, and the oil for light;

38 And the golden altar, and the anointing oil, and the sweet incense, and the hanging for the tabernacle-door:

39 The brazen altar, and his grate of brass, his staves, and all his vessels, the laver and his foot.

40 The hangings of the court, his pillars, and his sockets, and the hanging for the court-gate, his cords, and his pins, and all the vessels of the service of the tabernacle, for the tent of the congregation;

41 The clothes of service to do service in the holy place, and the holy garments for Aaron the priest, and his sons' garments, to minister in the priest's office.

42 According to all that the LORD

pleased to retain in his worship. The Jewish priests, however, wore this raiment only while officiating in the sanctuary; whereas in Egypt, for instance, the priests of Isis went every where clothed in white.

30. *They made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold.* To the explanations on this subject made above, ch. 28. 36, we have only here to add, that the priests generally among the heathen nations of antiquity were distinguished by the epithet *στέφανοφόροι*, *crown-bearers*, from the crowns worn upon their heads, which were usually made either of a laurel wreath, or of a rayed or

commanded Moses, so the children of Israel <sup>r</sup> made all the work.

43 And Moses did look upon all the work, and behold, they had

<sup>r</sup> ch. 39. 10.

serrated band of gold.—We here append a view of the high priest in his

done it as the LORD had commanded, even so had they done it: and Moses <sup>s</sup> blessed them.

<sup>s</sup> Lev. 9. 22, 23. Numb. 6. 23. Josh. 22. 6. 2 Sam. 6. 18. 1 Kings 8. 14. 2 Chron. 30. 27.

full costume, the details of which have been already given



THE HIGH PRIEST.

43. *And Moses blessed.* After having thoroughly examined the work in all its various items, and found it executed precisely according to the directions given, he confirms his acceptance of it at the hands of the people by solemnly invoking the blessing of God upon them. This teaches us, at the conclusion of every enterprise undertaken for a good

object devoutly to acknowledge the good hand of the Lord in enabling us to carry it forward to completion, and to implore his benediction upon the results. We are reminded also that those who serve the cause of religion have a claim to our prayers, even as if they were our own personal benefactors; for that cause we are bound to consider as our own.

## CHAPTER XL.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

2 On the first day of the <sup>a</sup>first month shalt thou set up <sup>b</sup>the tabernacle of the tent of the congregation.

3 And <sup>c</sup>thou shalt put therein the ark of the testimony, and cover the ark with the vail.

4 And <sup>d</sup>thou shalt bring in the table, and <sup>e</sup>set in order the things that are to be set in order upon it; <sup>f</sup>and thou shalt bring in the candlestick, and light the lamps thereof.

5 <sup>g</sup>And thou shalt set the altar of gold for the incense before the ark of the testimony, and put the hanging of the door to the tabernacle.

6 And thou shalt set the altar of the burnt-offering before the door

of the tabernacle of the tent of the congregation.

7 And <sup>h</sup>thou shalt set the laver between the tent of the congregation and the altar, and shalt put water therein.

8 And thou shalt set up the court round about, and hang up the hanging at the court-gate.

9 And thou shalt take the anointing oil, and <sup>i</sup>anoint the tabernacle, and all that *is* therein, and shalt hallow it, and all the vessels thereof: and it shall be holy.

10 And thou shalt anoint the altar of the burnt-offering, and all his vessels, and sanctify the altar: and <sup>k</sup>it shall be an altar most holy.

11 And thou shalt anoint the laver and his foot, and sanctify it.

12 <sup>l</sup>And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water.

<sup>a</sup> ch. 12. 2. & 13. 4. <sup>b</sup> ver. 17. & ch. 26. 1, 30. <sup>c</sup> ver. 21. ch. 26. 33. Numb. 4. 5. <sup>d</sup> ver. 22. ch. 26. 35. <sup>e</sup> ver. 23. ch. 25. 30, Lev. 24. 5, 6. <sup>f</sup> ver. 24. 25. <sup>g</sup> ver. 26.

<sup>h</sup> ver. 30. ch. 30. 18. <sup>i</sup> ch. 30. 26. <sup>k</sup> ch. 29. 36, 37. <sup>l</sup> Lev. 8. 1,—13.

## CHAPTER XL.

*The Tabernacle set up.*

2. *On the first day of the fifth month thou shalt set up the tabernacle.* From an attentive survey of all the incidents recorded to have happened after the exodus from Egypt, it appears that about six months intervened between that event and the commencement of the work of the tabernacle. Consequently they were about six months employed in the work itself; for the tabernacle was set up at the beginning of the second year, or one year lacking fifteen days after they had left Egypt. Considering the vast amount of curious and costly workmanship that was requisite, the undertaking was carried through with great expedition. But the hearts of the people were in this work, and this made all their labor light; and the union of men's hands, and much

zeal will necessarily bring to a speedy accomplishment any work that is undertaken.

3. *And cover the ark with the vail.* That is, hang up the separating vail so as to *hide* the ark from the public view. For this reason the vail is called, Num. 4. 5, 'the covering vail.'

9. *And thou shalt take the anointing oil and anoint, &c.* Every thing having been duly brought and disposed in its proper place, the consecration of the whole by sacred unction follows. In allusion to this it is said, Dan. 9, 24, 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.' The 'most holy' here is but another name for the *Christian*

13 And thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments, <sup>m</sup>and anoint him, and sanctify him; that he may minister unto me in the priest's office.

14 And thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with coats:

15 And thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office: for their anointing shall surely be an <sup>n</sup>everlasting priest-hood throughout their generations.

16 Thus did Moses; according to all that the LORD commanded him, so did he.

17 ¶ And it came to pass in the first month, in the second year, on the first *day* of the month, *that* the <sup>o</sup>tabernacle was reared up.

18 And Moses reared up the tabernacle, and fastened his sockets, and set up the boards thereof, and put in the bars thereof, and reared up his pillars.

19 And he spread abroad the tent over the tabernacle, and put the covering of the tent above upon it; as the LORD commanded Moses.

20 ¶ And he took and put <sup>p</sup>the testimony into the ark, and set the staves on the ark, and put the mercy-seat above upon the ark:

21 And he brought the ark into the tabernacle, and <sup>q</sup>set up the

<sup>m</sup> ch. 28. 41. <sup>n</sup> Numb. 25. 13. <sup>o</sup> ver. 1. Numb. 7. 1. <sup>p</sup> ch. 25. 16.

*Church* which was to be established at the end of the seventy weeks, and which was anointed at its setting up by the Holy Spirit in his miraculous effusion on the day of Pentecost.

15. *Their anointing shall be an everlasting priesthood.* The meaning is, that as far as the common priests were concerned, the efficacy of this first anointing should extend to the whole future line, so that they need not from

vail of the covering, and covered the ark of the testimony; as the LORD commanded Moses.

22 ¶ <sup>r</sup>And he put the table in the tent of the congregation upon the side of the tabernacle northward, without the vail.

23 <sup>s</sup> And he set the bread in order upon it before the LORD; as the LORD had commanded Moses.

24 ¶ <sup>t</sup>And he put the candlestick in the tent of the congregation, over against the table, on the side of the tabernacle southward.

25 And <sup>u</sup>he lighted the lamps before the LORD, as the LORD commanded Moses.

26 ¶ <sup>y</sup> And he put the golden altar in the tent of the congregation, before the vail:

27 <sup>z</sup>And he burnt sweet incense thereon; as the LORD commanded Moses.

28 ¶ <sup>a</sup> And he set up the hanging at the door of the tabernacle.

29 <sup>b</sup> And he put the altar of burnt-offering *by* the door of the tabernacle of the tent of the congregation, and <sup>c</sup>offered upon it the burnt-offering, and the meat-offering; as the LORD commanded Moses.

30 ¶ <sup>d</sup> And he set the laver between the tent of the congregation

<sup>q</sup> ch. 26. 33. & 35. 12. <sup>r</sup> ch. 26. 35. <sup>s</sup> ver. 4. <sup>t</sup> ch. 26. 35. <sup>u</sup> ver. 4. ch. 25. 37. <sup>y</sup> ver. 5. ch. 30. 6. <sup>z</sup> ch. 30. 7. <sup>a</sup> ver. 5. ch. 26. 36. <sup>b</sup> ver. 6. <sup>c</sup> ch. 29. 38. & c. <sup>d</sup> ver. 7. ch. 30. 18.

one generation to another receive successively the consecrating unction. With the High Priest the case was different. As he was elected, it was fit that he should, upon entering into office, be anointed; but in regard to the ordinary priests, who inherited their office as their birthright, the same necessity did not exist.

26. *And he put the golden altar in the tents of the congregation.* Of the gen

and the altar, and put water there, to wash *withal*.

31 And Moses, and Aaron, and his sons, washed their hands and their feet thereat:

32 When they went into the tent of the congregation, and when they came near unto the altar, they


washed; <sup>e</sup> as the Lord commanded Moses.

33 <sup>f</sup> And he reared up the court round about the tabernacle and the altar, and set up the hanging of the court-gate: so Moses finished the work.

<sup>e</sup> ch. 30. 19. <sup>f</sup> ver. 8. ch. 27. 9. 16.

eral aspect of the interior of the tabernacle, when all its furniture was proper-

ly arranged, a tolerably correct idea may be formed from the accompanying cut.



THE INTERIOR OF THE TABERNACLE.

33. *And he reared up the court round about the tabernacle, &c.* As all the particulars have been formerly explained, nothing more is here necessary than

25•

to present to the eye the general appearance of the tabernacle with the court, altar, and laver; the whole surmounted by the pillar of cloud.





made ready, the great and glorious Occupant now makes a solemn entry into the habitation in which he had promised to dwell, and of which he now virtually says, 'This is the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever.' By this act Jehovah not only testified the restoration of his forfeited favor to the people, and his gracious acceptance of their services, but also gave typically a pledge of the future *tabernacling* of Christ, the true Shekinah, in human flesh, and of an ulterior visible manifestation of the divine glory in the latter days on the earth. This latter great event is distinctly foreshown in the following passages in language bearing evident allusion to that of Moses in the narrative before us; Ezek. 43, 4, 5, 'And the *Glory of the Lord* came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is toward the east.—So the Spirit took me up and brought me into the inner court; and behold the *Glory of the Lord* filled the house.' John also in the Revelation, chap. 21. 10, 11, alluding to the same illustrious period of the church, says, 'And he carried me in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God; *having the Glory of God.*' For ourselves we think it deserving of the most serious and profound enquiry, whether this 'glory to be revealed' be not a another term for the whole heavenly world composed of the glorified spiritual bodies of Christ and his saints, together with his holy angels, coming down to enter into a new and abiding connexion with the church on earth in its latter-day prosperity. To what else can it refer? Our Savior expressly assured his disciples that 'hereafter they should see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending, upon the Son of Man.' Equally explicit is the declara-

tion of John in the Apocalypse, ch. 21. 3, 'And I heard a great voice from heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people; and God himself shall be with them, and shall be their God.' As the glory of the Shekinah came in all its effulgence and took possession of the tabernacle when it was prepared for its reception, so when the earth, by the previous outpouring of the Spirit and the universal diffusion and establishment of the gospel shall have become fitted for the divine inhabitation, are we not taught to expect that the glorified Savior and the glorified saved—the substance of the resplendent Cloud and the shining Cherubim of the most holy place—shall come and fix themselves in permanent sojourn in the temple thus prepared for them? Not that we are to understand this as implying that the glorified saints will ever be promiscuously mingled together with the tenants of earth, the dwellers in houses of clay and houses of wood or stone, but simply that there will be a visible communication and an intimate relation between these two great departments of the Lord's family. We have no reason to suppose that spiritual bodies will ever inhabit material tenements on the earth, but as there was at the birth of Christ a sudden and glorious manifestation of a multitude of the heavenly host in the air, so we are perhaps taught that a similar developement of the invisible world will be made and become permanent in the latter day, abiding in immediate proximity to our globe, and thus giving its ultimate fulfilment to the dream of Jacob of an angelic intercourse between heaven and earth. In this state of things, the separating veil between the holy and the most place, will be done away. The cherubim will be 'living creatures' and pass freely out into the outer room. Sure we are, that if these predictions do not announce the

35 And Moses <sup>h</sup> was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation,

<sup>h</sup> Lev. 16. 2. 1 Kings 8. 11. 2 Chron. 14. 5.

sublime event now suggested, as they plainly point to *some* fulfilment of stupendous character, it behoves the interpreters of the oracles of God to inform an inquiring world what they *do* mean. It is impossible to be faithful to the entrusted truth of heaven, and permit its most sublime revelations to lie shrouded in obscurity under the idle plea that they are a part of prophecy, and that prophecy was not designed to be understood till it is accomplished. Not indeed that we would maintain that prophecy can be *equally well* understood before and after its accomplishment, but if it be unintelligible, why are we exhorted to study it? The truth is, the prophecies touch the very vital doctrines of Christianity. Its grand sanctions—its promises of bliss and its threatenings of woe—the judgment, the resurrection, and the New Jerusalem—are inseparably interwoven with the fulfilment of the great chain of scriptural prophecy; and we doubt not the time is not far distant when the interests of truth will *imperiously demand* that the mysteries of the Apocalypse shall be unfolded.

35. *And Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, &c.* The glory of the Shekinah shone so bright and dazzling, that it was absolutely insufferable to the sight. Indeed, as the phenomenon was in effect the same with that which appeared on the summit of Sinai, and of which it is said, Ex. 24. 16, that the part of it covered by the cloud, when partially exposed to view, was like unto ‘devouring fire,’ the tabernacle could not now be entered for the same reason that the cloud could not then have been entered, even by Moses, without a special summons to that effect from Jehovah himself. Precisely the same thing happened at the

dedication of the temple of Solomon, when, we are told, 1 Kings, 8. 10, 11, ‘The cloud filled the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.’ A palpable allusion to this incident is also to be recognised in Rev. 15. 7, 8, although the meaning of the prophecy is too profound to be hastily decided upon; ‘And one of the four beasts gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God, who liveth for ever and ever. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.’ Moses was obliged to wait till the overwhelming brightness had somewhat abated, and the Glory had retired within the veil. That these circumstances were designed to point forward to some grand accomplishment of far more illustrious character, in the state described in the closing chapters of Ezekiel and John, when the divine Glory shall again take up its abode on earth, we have no doubt. But as the *precise manner* of its ultimate fulfilment appears to be hidden by a veil at present inscrutable, we are thrown upon a *moral* improvement of the occurrence, upon which no mystery rests. It affords another intimation how awful and terrible is the majesty of Jehovah when he is pleased to reveal himself to human eyes. How impossible it was for Moses to behold it without a screen, we have already had occasion to notice. The greatest and the best of men are utterly unable to stand before it. ‘Our God is a consuming fire.’ How thankful then are we called to be, that we may contemplate the softened glories of the Godhead in

36 <sup>i</sup>And when the cloud was taken up from over the tabernacle, the children of Israel went onward in all their journeys:

37 But <sup>k</sup>if the cloud were not

<sup>i</sup> Numb. 9. 17. & 10. 11. · Neh. 9. 19.  
<sup>k</sup> Numb. 9. 19,—22.

Jesus Christ, who has drawn nigh and entered as our forerunner into the holy place not made with hands, that we might in due time be admitted to a participation of the same honor and joy.

36, 37. *And when the cloud was taken up, &c.* Thus the cloud was a guide to the camp of Israel in their march through the wilderness. While the cloud remained upon or over the tabernacle, they rested abiding in their tents; when it removed, they removed and followed their ærial conductor. This is more fully detailed Num. 9. 15—23, and long afterwards mentioned with grateful remembrance by the Psalmist, Ps. 78. 14, —105. 39; and Nehemiah notices its continuance as an extraordinary mercy notwithstanding their great provocation in the matter of the golden calf; ch. 9. 19, 'Yet thou in thy manifold mercies forsookest them not in the wilderness; the pillar of cloud departed not from them by day, to lead them in the way; neither the pillar of fire by night, to show them light and the way wherein they should go.'

38. *For the cloud of the Lord was upon the tabernacle, by day, &c.* Chal. and Targ. Jon. 'The cloud of the Glory of the Lord.' Targ. Jerus. 'The cloud of the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord.' That same mysterious cloud which had led them up from Egypt, and which had all along been pregnant with wonders, now settled upon the tabernacle and hovered over it, even in the hottest and clearest day; for this was not a cloud of which it could be said that the sun 'wearieth the thick cloud; he scattereth the bright cloud.' It was

taken up, then they journeyed not till the day that it was taken up.

38 For <sup>l</sup>the cloud of the LORD was upon the tabernacle by day, and fire was on it by night, in the sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys.

<sup>l</sup> ch. 13. 21. Numb. 9. 15.

a cloud that served as a remarkable token of the Divine Presence, constantly visible day and night to all Israel, and to those who were situated in the remotest corners of the camp, so that they could never have occasion to propose the question, 'Is the Lord among us, or is he not?' They could not doubt it, unless they could doubt the evidence of their own senses.—¶ *And fire was on it by night in the sight of all the house of Israel, &c.* The fire and the cloud were not, as we have before remarked, two different and distinct things. It was one and the same pillar which was a dark cloud by day and a shining fire by night. Indeed, as the original for 'on it' is בּוֹ *bo*, in it, it is contended by Fagius and others that the true meaning is, that the fire was *in the cloud* by night, i. e. that the cloud was the seat of it, that it did not emanate from any source different from the cloud; not that the fire was so enveloped in the cloud as to be invisible, for on that supposition, the fire was in it by day as well as by night. It is possible that the term 'fire' is to be understood merely of a phosphorescent glow which the exterior of the cloud was made to assume at night, and thus to be viewed as entirely distinct from the inner enwrapped glory, which Moses so ardently desired to see. These are particulars in respect to the cloud which it is exceedingly difficult to determine; but the general image can easily be brought before the mind, and we can see at once how express is the allusion to this incident in the words of the prophet, Is. 4. 5, 'And the Lord will

create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for upon all the glory shall be a defence.' The dwelling-places of Mount Zion here spoken of are doubtless *Christian churches*, and the intimation seems to be, that in the times of the gospel each individual church, or congregation of believers, should be as complete in itself in its endowments, and prerogatives; that it shall be as truly distinguished by the tokens of the Divine presence, guidance, and guardianship, as was the one congregation of Israel with its one tabernacle, surmounted by the pillar of cloud and of fire. The Jewish nation formed but one church, having its unity concentrated in one place and one system of worship. As such it was not so properly a type of the whole collective body of Christian churches, nor of any one great sectarian division of the church, as of each particular single church, duly organized and furnished. All such churches the Scriptures represent as complete and independent in themselves, and subject to no jurisdiction save that of Christ administered by his word, spirit, and officers.

—¶ *Throughout all their journeys.*

This circumstance is so prominent in the history of the wanderings of Israel, and so replete with interest in itself, that we know not how to forbear enlarging somewhat more at length upon it. Whatever may have been the impression produced by it upon the minds of those to whose senses it was present, it soars majestically before *our* minds as a threefold token of the divine *presence, protection, and guidance*. In this sublime symbol the journeying host could but feel that God was always nigh them, resting with them when they rested, and moving with them when they moved. Never could they cast their eyes upon that towering pillar, ever

dark by day and bright by night, always maintaining its position, and not, like other clouds, changing, breaking, and dissipating into the surrounding air; never, we say, could they look upon this august object without being reminded that 'a God at hand, and not afar off, was the Lord in his holy habitation.' But not only so; it was a source of *protection*. It shaded them, as a pleasant pavilion, from the rays of the noon-tide sun, and under its canopy they could rest as under the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Nor less did it serve as a defence from their enemies, than as a shade from the beams of the sultry sun. Its descending and interposing folds placed a wall of adamant between them and their Egyptian pursuers, beyond which they could no more penetrate than they could have broken through the granite barriers of Sinai and Horeb. But last, though not least, they had in the cloudy pillar a constant *guide and director*. It conducted them in all their movements, and indicated to them all their rests. They rose up and journeyed whenever it began to move; they stopped at the moment when it became stationary. When it rose they knew not whither it would go, but it led them constantly in the right way; and they had no inquiries to make, no doubts or fears to cherish, nothing to do but to yield themselves implicitly to its guidance. What a wondrous mercy to be thus conducted in all their way! Travellers, especially in desert and inhospitable climes, like that which now lay before the children of Israel, are prone to be concerned about their route and about their safety. They lie down at night with planted guards around them, and look with fearful solicitude to the events of the coming day, lest perchance they should lose their way, or their water become exhausted, or their strength fail. But no misgivings of this nature could trouble the peace of the favored hosts of Israel.

They could lay them down to rest without any care how far or whither they should go on the morrow, or whether they should move at all. No anxiety as to food or drink could afflict their minds, for without any care or thought of theirs, 'their bread would be given and their water would be sure,' and if they journeyed, an unerring guide would mark out their place of rest. 'Happy, thrice happy, ye highly favored of heaven!' we are prone to exclaim in view of this distinguished lot of the chosen tribes. Thrown often ourselves into the greatest perplexity as to the decisions we shall make, and the conduct we shall pursue in life, we naturally feel how great would be the blessing of being ever thus sensibly directed by the Lord.

But let us not disparage our own privileges compared with those of the seed of Jacob. As to the *presence* of Jehovah with us, encompassing our ways, we are not left destitute of that. If we have not the Shekinah in *shadow* we have it in *substance*, in him who is 'the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person.' His *tabernacling* has already, in one sense, been with men in human flesh, and he is the proper object to bring before our thoughts, whenever we would have an equivalent for the visible symbol of Jehovah. In him the promise is, 'I will dwell in (among) them, and walk in (among) them, and they shall be my people.' 'I will never leave you nor forsake you.' By his spirit he is present with his whole church and with every individual member of it. By that Spirit he will abide with them for ever, cheering their hearts and renewing their strength by the light of his countenance.


Do we desire *protection* as real and

as effectual as that which spread its panoply over the chosen race? The consoling strain in which, if his, we are assured of it, is uttered in the language of the Psalmist, 'The Lord is thy keeper: the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil: he shall preserve thy soul. The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth, and even for ever more.'

Finally, do we desire *guidance*, an *infallible light* to direct us in all the mazes and perplexities of our path—something which shall stand to us instead of the luminous pillar that, in the dark night poured its splendors upon the shifting sands and the rocky roughnesses of the Arabian desert? Doubtless, *secret intimations of Providence* are sometimes given to this end, especially if sought in earnest prayer and humble watchfulness. But however this may be, we have a more sure directory of duty. The Bible is *our* pillar of cloud and of fire. Let us look to the pages of that inspired word which is a light to our feet, and a lamp to our path,' and we shall cease to desiderate the guiding glory which aided only the outward eye, and directed only a local sojourn. We have all and abound. We have the oracles of truth and life; we have the proffer of the illuminating Spirit; we have the promise of a better Canaan than that which smiled beyond Jordan; and if we can sincerely say with the Psalmist, in respect to the divine leading on earth, 'Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel,' we may confidently add the supplementary clause, 'And afterward receive me to glory.'





[illegible]





BS1245 .B978 1852 v.2 RES-510RAGE  
Notes, critical and practical, on the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00085 5926